REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01735 9628

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1866

# METHODIST

# QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## 1866.

VOLUME XLVIII.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XVIII.

D. D. WHEDON, D.D., EDITOR.

New York:
PUBLISHED BY CARLTON & PORTER,
200 MULBERRY-STREET.
1866.

I 706206

# CONTENTS OF VOL. XLVIII.—1866.

## JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

OUR HISTORICAL POSITION AS INDICATED BY NATURE AND PHILOSOPHY..... 5
The late Prof. WILSON, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

BOSSUET AS A PERSECUTOR..... 22
Rev. HENRY M. BAIRD, A.M., University of the City of New York.

HERMENEUTICS AND HOMILETICS; OR, THE STUDY OF THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES AND PREACHING. [ARTICLE FIRST.]..... 37
STEPHEN M. VAIL, D.D., Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H.

NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE..... 51
Rev. W. H. BARNES, A.M., Indianapolis, Ind.

DIVINE PASSION..... 64
Rev. T. M. GRIFFITH, A.M., Somerton, Pa.

OUR ITINERANCY..... 78
Rev. J. T. CRANE, D.D., Morristown, N. J.

HOW CAN WE TEACH GREEK?..... 90
THEODORE DWIGHT, Esq., Brooklyn, N. Y.

WARREN'S INTRODUCTION TO SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY..... 100
JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., Germantown, Pa.

SPIRIT OF THE SOUTHERN METHODIST PRESS..... 124
EDITOR.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 130

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 135

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 137

QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE..... 140

## APRIL NUMBER.

THE CENTENARY OF AMERICAN METHODISM..... 165
T. M. EDDY, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

THE LATEST ATTEMPTS TO HARMONIZE THE MOSAIC HISTORY OF CREATION AND GEOLOGY..... 187
DR. O. FÖCKLER, Professor of Theology in Giessen. Translated from the German by W. F. W.

OUR ITINERANCY. [ARTICLE SECOND.]..... 206
J. T. CRANE, D.D., Morristown, N. J.

LIFE AND MARTYRDOM OF STEPHEN..... 222
Rev. L. T. TOWNSEND, A.M., Watertown, Mass.

THE 1260 YEARS OF ANTICHRIST..... 235
F. G. HIBBARD, D.D., Canandaigua, N. Y.

LIBERALISM IN EUROPE..... 256
Prof. GEORGE F. COMFORT, Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa.

THE TWO METHODISMS, NORTH AND SOUTH..... 276
EDITOR.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 280

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 287

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 289

QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE..... 293

## JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

THE SECOND GENERAL CONFERENCE..... 325
ABEL STEVENS, LL.D., Mamaroneck, N. Y.

BUSHNELL'S VICARIOUS SACRIFICE..... 350
Rev. C. H. FOWLER, B.D., Chicago, Ill.

HERMENEUTICS AND HOMILETICS. [ARTICLE SECOND.]..... 371
S. M. VAIL, D.D., Professor in Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H.

REMINISCENCES OF REV. HENRY BOEHM..... 386
Rev. LUTHER W. PECK, A.M., Hyde Park, Scranton, Pa.

JOHN BRIGHT..... 407
Rev. W. F. MALLALIEU, Boston, Mass.

RELATIONS OF THE COLORED PEOPLE TO THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH..... 418
Rev. JOHN H. CALDWELL, A.M., Lagrange, Ga.

THE NEW YORK EAST CONFERENCE AND THE SOUTHERN GENERAL CONFERENCE..... 443
EDITOR.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 463

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 466

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 469

QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE..... 473

## OCTOBER NUMBER.

THE ORIGIN OF REVOLUTIONS IN PUBLIC OPINION..... 485
E. O. HAVEN, D.D., LL.D., President of University of Michigan.

THE GREEK CHURCH, IN ITS RELATION TO THE PROTESTANT..... 496
Rev. R. B. WELCH, A.M., Clifton Park, N. Y.

WORSHIP OF RELICS, AND THE MIRACLES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH..... 514
PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., New York.

CHILDHOOD CONVERSION..... 531
BOSTWICK HAWLEY, D.D., Fort Plain, N. Y.

VOLTAIRE..... 546
From the Revue Chretienne.

FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON..... 560
Rev. E. H. DEWART, Toronto, Canada.

MILTON'S EARLY LIFE..... 580
Rev. PHARCELLUS CHURCH, D.D., New York.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 595
FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 599
SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 601
QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE..... 608

THE

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1866.

## ART. I.—OUR HISTORICAL POSITION AS INDICATED BY NATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.*

ALL the progressive stages of creation were but preparatory to its last and crowning act, the *creation of man.* To make ready his habitation for him, and adapt it to his physical, his intellectual, and his moral development, God patiently labored through countless ages in the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms—in the sea and on the land; and has left, written on the pages of the great "stone-book" of nature, the hieroglyphic records of the magnitude of his labors. All the phenomena of matter, as well as the higher wonders of life, have their only significance as they contribute to *man's* advancement, and are subservient to his immortal destiny. On him all nature waits; for him the winds blow and the sun shines; for him the rain falls, and the grass grows, the flowers bloom, and the birds sing. It is but natural, then, to suppose that in the laws which guide the movements of these subordinate forms of creation, we might look for indications of the uniform course and higher tendencies of humanity, that the grand choral harmony of the spheres should be attuned in unison with the grander and more harmonious movement of human progress.

Science is rapidly confirming these suggestions of intuition, and conclusively demonstrating the complete harmony between

* It will be seen by several allusions it contains that the present article was written while the late rebellion was in full vigor. The lamented young author did not live to witness how well his predictions of the result would be verified.—ED.

the course of nature and the course of history. There is nothing which it reveals more plainly than the uniform tendency of all the great movements of nature westward. For example, the electric forces generated in the crust of the earth by the rays of the sun in its daily course, flow in constant streams around it from east to west, making it a vast magnet, clothing it with vegetation, sustaining its animal life, and directing the course of human activity. The very winds of heaven, also, and the waves of the ocean, that seem to sport in such wild confusion about us, obedient to the omnipotence of law, unite in one steady, ever-flowing current, both of the air and of the ocean, that swells the sails of commerce, and carries civilization to the West.

Reason would teach us that man was destined to follow this great highway, so distinctly marked out for him by the majestic movements of nature; and experience confirms the impressive lesson. History, from its first dawning in the East, has steadily held its course on toward its culmination in the West: the shadow has never gone back on that dial! When one nation after another has played out its part in the great drama—when it has personated the idea it was intended to represent in the scheme of Providence, and is no longer needed—its departing spirit ever finds its revival toward the West. Every people that has at any time represented the highest idea, that has embodied the last and best expression of humanity, has ever been found on the western border of advancing civilization. It was not, then, by the dictate of a wild fancy, but of a true inspiration, that the poet-philosopher, a century and a half ago, uttered that oft-repeated prophecy, which time has so amply fulfilled, "Westward the star of empire takes its way!"

It is easy, then, to infer that the colonization that is to be successful in planting new principles and building new empires must go forward, not backward—toward the setting, not the rising, sun. So, too, we may see that Christianity, the reanimating spirit that is to breathe new life into the dead nations of the East, and make the dry bones live again, must come to them in the course of nature and on the track of commerce and civilization; and that, therefore, the missionary effort that will yet be most effective in revivifying the vast

continent of Asia, must proceed from our western shores. We may also learn that when we, as a people, shall have proved false to our vocation or fulfilled it, the principles we represent will not die, even should we cease to exist as a nation. Stout hearts and strong arms will then be found to rescue our palladium from the ruins of our greatness, and bear it in safety to other shores, where its sacred influence will still guard the dearest interests of humanity. Thus shall civilization revisit the birth-place of our race, and on a higher level, and under brighter auspices, begin the cycle of history anew.

Let us pause a while, if we can, amid the bewildering whirl of events, the clash of arms, and the mighty tread of armies that shakes the very continent, and calmly endeavor to trace the successive steps in this westward march of civilization, and see if, by the light of *nature* and the guidance of *philosophy*, we discover our *true position in history*, and learn what our mission as a nation is, what God means for us to do in this crisis, and what he means to do with us and for us as a people.

History, some one has said, is but the biography of eminent individuals. This is true, inasmuch as the prominent men of any age or nation always embody the most striking characteristics of the individual life of the masses; they are the representative men, and stand for the people. History, then, is but the experience of the individual projected on a grander scale, and extending through centuries. The one contains no more elements than the other. The development of the race in history has no more stages than the gradual normal unfolding of each individual character in the short period of a human life. We may take man, then, as the microcosm, as the archetype, of society; as containing in himself the germ of all human history.

The human mind, in its ultimate analysis, contains *three great, original, innate ideas*, and but three. All others are but modifications or developments of these three. They are first, the idea of the *infinite;* second, the idea of the *finite;* and third, the idea of the *relation of the infinite to the finite.** The first, the idea of the infinite, gives us by intuition our first conception of God as infinite power and goodness. It may be said to be the original image of God in the soul of man. The second,

* Cousin.

the idea of the finite, gives to us our consciousness of ourselves and of the world about us; or, as the Germans say, the "me" and the "not me." The third and last, the idea of the relation of the infinite to the finite, teaches us the dependence of all finite existence on an infinite, overarching power, and shows us God manifest in his works and in the dealings of his providence.

Though these three ideas always coexist in the mind, for the one always suggests the others, yet, in their development, the successive predominance of each over the others, marks three distinct periods in the history of the individual, as well as in that of the nation and of the race. These may be called, first, *the religious* or *credulous period*, corresponding to infancy and childhood; second, that of *skepticism* or *inquiry*, which marks the period of youth; third, the *philosophical*, or that of *reason and faith* combined, which belongs to the period of mature manhood. The child, in his uncorrupted innocence, is truly devout. His first dawning consciousness is that of a power above and beyond him, to which he instinctively bows in humble submission, and taught at his mother's knee, his first lisping accents go up in simple, but earnest prayer to God. His faith is unbounded. He worships and questions not. Truly the poet has said, "Heaven lies about us in our infancy;" but as truly, "Shades of the prison-house begin to close upon the growing boy." His first inevitable step forward brings the longing for freedom and knowledge. He would be "as gods, knowing good and evil." He plucks the forbidden fruit. He questions, doubts, disbelieves. Driven from the Eden of his innocence, he goes forth rejoicing in his liberty, with the world before him to conquer. Enraptured with the growing consciousness of his own intellectual powers, he forgets God. Exulting in his mastery over the powers of nature, he impiously banishes God from his own creation, and deifies *reason* and *law* in his stead, vainly fancying himself, the while, a philosopher! He is only a skeptic. But when this phase of his development, that of the idea of the finite, has run its course, and given him the knowledge of the true measure of his own powers and of the world about him—when error and suffering have accomplished their true ministry, and done their perfect work, and the dry husks of skep-

ticism no longer satisfy his hunger—the original voice of God in his soul, like a new revelation, begins again to make itself heard, and calls him, like a prodigal from his wanderings, to the good and the true. A new life of the Spirit begins to develop within him. It is then that he begins to attain to the highest knowledge of himself and of his duty; to a true, a divine philosophy. He is then prepared to see the manifestations of God everywhere. All nature becomes vocal with his praises. He acknowledges him in the dealings of his providence. He hears his voice through all history. "He has sounded the key-note of nature and spirit, the earth-beat, sea-beat, heart-beat, which makes the tune to which the sun rolls, and the globule of blood and the sap of the trees."

Corresponding to these three well-marked periods in the life of the individual, are the *three grand epochs of history*, each marked by its distinctive characteristics, and requiring a separate period of time, a peculiar race, and a fitting theater for its manifestation.

In the infancy of the race the idea of the *infinite* had its development, and predominated over the others. Its proper theater was the East. Its home was amid the lofty mountain ranges of Central Asia and on the vast plains of India. The face of nature here is marked by vastness, sublimity, and unity of structure. The continent lacks the variety and diversity of feature necessary to give freedom of intercourse and stimulate activity among the nations that people it. Life here is, consequently, characterized by immobility: civilization is stationary and progress is impossible, for man is yet in his infancy, and instead of being the master of nature, he is its slave. The forces of nature and the hosts of heaven, at whose mercy and in whose power he feels himself to be, become the object of his servile worship. Everywhere the civilization of the East bears the impress of this bondage to nature. Philosophy here is but a blind fatalism; government, a theocracy, for the most part, hence an inexorable despotism. This is the *religious* or *credulous* period of history, the period of inspiration, when the voice of Jehovah was heard speaking in and through man, the golden age of the poets, the paradise of the Bible.

But the period of infancy, with its discipline, passes, and

youth, with its activity, begins. Man breaks loose from the fetters of nature and enters on his career of liberty. The first great epoch of history is ended. The nations of the Orient have fulfilled their mission and personated their ideas. The ever-advancing spirit of civilization leaves them but lifeless forms; and there they stand through all succeeding history, the petrified monuments of the infancy and imbecility of the race.

The continent of Europe is the school where the youth is to grow to manhood, and learn his liberty and moral responsibility. Variety and diversity of form are, therefore, its characteristics. Its inland seas and rivers, its clustering islands and peninsulas, affording ample facilities for commerce, for movement, and change, present a fitting stage for the busy elements of this epoch to play their stirring part in this grand world-drama. Greece, situated close to the western limit of Asia, yet separated from it, and embracing in a narrow compass all the characteristic features of the whole European continent, marks the transition from the old to the new. On it is rehearsed, on a small scale, the important part that Europe is to represent in the scheme of Providence. Greek civilization, embracing, as it does, the commingling elements of the past and the future, both through its art and its poetry, celebrates the passage of the race from bondage to freedom. Philosophy here, leaving the abstract and the mystical, now deals with man and his relations, becoming an intellectual and moral philosophy. Even the religion of the Greek is but a deification of human faculties and passions. Instead of contemplating the absolute, remorseless God of the Asiatic, his worship goes no higher than Olympus, peopled with the gods he has himself created after his own image, and sharing his own feelings and frailties. Instead of worshiping blindly the forces of nature, he gives to each one its appropriate divinity to preside over its functions, thus peopling the woods and streams with a motley crowd of nymphs and dryads, fauns and satyrs, endowed with the forms and affections of humanity—another expression only of the idea of man's superiority to nature.

As in Greece, so throughout this whole European epoch, civilization is characterized by the development of individu-

ality, personality, and by immense material, intellectual and moral progress. As the continent lacks grandeur and unity of form, so society lacks unity of organization. Being intended only to represent the idea of the *finite*—of individuality and diversity—it has no principle of association, no grand *central idea*, to combine the nations into one powerful commonwealth, possessing one common life, and animated by one lofty common purpose. Hence Europe has ever been but an aggregation, not a union, of individual, active, struggling sovereignties, with no tie but selfishness and no higher aim than interest.

One nation after another has tried to organize these diverse elements into one form, controlled by one power, and perished in the attempt. Greece, first, with all her philosophy, her literature and her art, whose refining influence has been felt through all the centuries, had not even the power to control the warring elements within her own borders; and, losing her liberty in the fratricidal strife of her own contending factions, passed the scepter on to Rome. She next attempted, by the might of her conquering arms, to subject the world to the one idea of the *sovereignty of the empire*. She, too, failed, and the proud empire, unable to assimilate the conquered nations, fell to pieces under the crushing blows of the barbarians of the North. But amid the ruins of Roman greatness Christianity grew and strengthened, until the Church became a power in the world. Through her instrumentality, Germany next gained the supremacy of Europe, and for a while controlled the destiny of the nations. But Christianity, whose kingdom is not of this world, was so overloaded with heathenish superstitions, and so corrupted by the pomp and pride of power, that instead of a bond of union, it became an element of disintegration; and, by its mighty struggles to save its own vitality, it shivered into fragments the vast empire whose power had been built upon its prostitution. And there Germany stands to-day, in her imbecility, as if in very mockery of her former grandeur, without even power enough to unite her petty principalities on the basis of a common nationality. This was the last great effort to unite the fragmentary elements of European civilization under one power and upon one principle; unless we except the frightful attempt of Napoleon to wipe out all Europe's bound-lines with blood,

and make her people bow to the one idea of—Napoleon. His career, however, was but meant to terrify the nations, to sweep away the debris of rotten dynasties, and then end in grief and a broken heart on St. Helena. Since then the highest manifestation of European statesmanship has been in efforts to secure the individuality of nations, to systematize selfishness and preserve the balance of power!

The mission of Europe in history is now fulfilled. Its glory has passed away, and we must look for its revival elsewhere, and under other forms. It, also, has passed through the successive periods of infancy, youth, and manhood, and now the signs of decrepitude begin to show themselves. Even as far back as the middle of the fifteenth century, indications of a new era began to be felt. New ideas and higher aspirations began to swell men's hearts; and as they stood upon the shore of the, to them, boundless Atlantic, gazing after the setting sun, they dreamed of a new continent, the home of new principles, the theater of a new civilization. It was then that, in the fullness of time, an humble mariner—a wild dreamer, they called him—set out from a little seaport in Spain, in three crazy little boats, to discover, he knew not what; and falling into the trade-wind and the ocean current, he was carried blindly onward, as by the breath of destiny, to the shores of a new world. Was it an accidental coincidence, merely, that at the same time that the spirit of discovery of that period gave to the race a new continent for its development, its inventive genius should also furnish the printing-press, which was to contribute so much toward shaping its destiny? There are no accidents in history. Nor was it an accident either, that, close on the heels of these two pregnant events, the spirit of Christianity, which was to be the animating soul of the new epoch, began to revive beneath the mummeries and corruptions of the Church, and in its terrible struggle for life, to upheave the face of Europe, toppling over the thrones that had prostituted it to their base uses, breaking the fetters of the masses, sharpening their intellects, purifying their morals, and awakening their desires for civil liberty. Thus it ever is in history as in nature, that under the corruption and decay of the old form, the more vigorous germs of a new life are gradually unfolding themselves.

These new vital forces, which, by being pent up in narrow Europe, were shaking society with a moral earthquake, at once begin to seek the new outlet thus opened; and emigration, bearing with it the elements of a new empire, begins to flow in a resistless, ever-swelling tide, westward. And now that Europe has completed the duty assigned to it of training the youth of the race, developing its physical energies, educating its intellect, teaching it its duty, and preparing it to comprehend its high destiny, it becomes manifest that America is to be the home where its matured and vigorous manhood is to be spent, and where it is to perform the work to which God has called it, and for which he has been so long preparing it.

As Greece, lying on the western border of Asia, marked the transition from the *first* to the *second* period of history, so England, lying on the west of Europe, yet detached from it, and representing in miniature the grander face of the new continent, is the stepping-stone by which humanity is to pass from the *second* to the *third* and *highest* stage of its career. As it was not a mere matter of chance that Spain, lying at the southern point of Europe, and close to the great pathway of the ocean, should send forth the bold adventurer whom the winds and the waves should carry to the new world, so, too, it was no accident that England, with her sturdy, conquering race, her vigorous Anglo-Saxon tongue, her immortal literature, embodying the highest aspirations of humanity, and her grand old constitution, embracing under the narrow forms and traditions of a dead past the principles of liberty, which were to make the living future glorious, should plant her colonies on the best part of it.

Let us now consider the magnificent domain God has given us for our heritage, and see if we can learn the lesson it teaches, and comprehend the responsibility the generous gift imposes. As we look at it stretching so grandly across the continent from ocean to ocean, embracing all the climate most favorable to the highest activity and the most perfect development of the race, we cannot fail to see what a powerful influence its physical features are to have in moulding the character and shaping the career of the people who dwell on it. Even our position between the two great oceans is not without

its significance; for while they isolate us completely from the social and political influence of other nations, they at the same time afford a free commercial intercourse with all the world; showing, that while we are to be permitted to pursue our career without foreign interference, all peoples and all climes are to be made tributary to our advancement Our continent, thus placed in an independent position, is also characterized by a peculiar and strongly-marked structure. Though it is not a repetition of the forms of either of the continents of the Old World, it combines all the characteristic features of both; the unity and grandeur of Asia with the variety and diversity of Europe, blended harmoniously together into one compact organism, with its own important, well-defined functions to perform in the education of the race. The stupendous forms of nature here, while they give massiveness of outline to the continent, inspire loftiness and sublimity of thought and character; and now, that the infant of Asia has grown to vigorous manhood in America, nature here, instead of presenting barriers to his freedom of movement, or cramping his energies and enslaving his faculties, only offers greater temptations to his activity and wider fields for his enterprise. Our extended seacoast, made still greater by its thousands of intensive bays and inlets, affords unrivaled facilities for foreign commerce; while our inland lakes and countless rivers give unbounded freedom of internal trade and social intercourse from one extremity of our vast territory to the other; while variety of physical feature and diversity of climate, soil, and productions give rise to an almost endless variety of character, interest, and occupation, thus developing the greatest number of faculties and thereby securing the greatest possible economical and political freedom: yet nowhere does this diversity of physical conditions furnish contrasts so marked as to justify the existence of separate sovereignties or independent political organizations within our borders; for, above and through all this variety, we can recognize the great predominating feature of *unity* and *compactness* of form and structure. See how the great mountain-chains, the huge backbone of the continent, link the North and the South together. The navigable rivers, the great arteries through which the trade of the whole continent pulsates, all flow southward to

the sea. The very rocks on which they stand unite the North and the South on one solid, everlasting foundation. Nature has nowhere put a barrier or dividing line between them. But if she has separated any sections, they are the East and the West. Two unbroken ranges of mountains, with their frowning battlements piercing the clouds, and separated by the trackless plains stretched out between them, seem to interpose a hinderance to the advancement of civilization across the continent. But man here is the *master* of nature; and like a giant he sweeps away the obstacles she throws in the path of his progress. He binds the Atlantic and the Pacific together with iron bands; and steam and the lightning bring the East and the West together into one common brotherhood. The one great lesson, then, that nature and the enterprise of man have written in legible characters all over this continent, is that of unity and grandeur of form, controlling and harmonizing endless variety: teaching us that physically there is no North, no South; no East, no West. Can we read the lesson?

See now how our political organization has been based upon and adapted to these great controlling physical characteristics of the continent. Here again we find expressed the same idea of diversity, controlled and harmonized by the all-pervading principle of unity: variety of local organization sufficient to secure the freest individuality, the most stirring activity and the richest material development, yet subordinate to, and fused into, one sublime *nationality;* a nationality, at last, and for the first time in history, based upon the dignity and the rights of humanity, recognizing, at last, the *right of all men to be free*, and pledged before the world and in the sight of Heaven, to enforce that right on every foot of our wide domain: a principle broad enough and vital enough to cement into one harmonious, lasting union, the fragmentary elements of all former civilizations.

It is worth while to note the progressive development of the form of our government, and some of the circumstances which influenced it. The greatly diversified features of our Atlantic coast, as well as the varied characters and interests of the early settlers, naturally favored the establishment of separate colonies, with independent local governments adapted to their

separate necessities, yet all subject to the authority of the mother country. But having all braved the dangers of the deep, and the hardships of the wilderness for the common purpose of finding in the New World a wider liberty and a freer enterprise than narrow Europe could afford them, it was natural that they should combine to resist the tyranny of England, which they had all suffered in common. It was then that through the baptism of blood and fire our fathers rose to the conception of the *inalienable right of all men to be free*, and *the duty of government to secure that right.* It was amid the fermentation of the moral elements of that hard struggle that this sublime conception took shape, and became crystalized forever in the Declaration of Independence.

Even after they had thrown off the yoke of England, with their European ideas and prejudices yet clinging about them, they still endeavored to establish and maintain their independent sovereignties. But soon they began to catch glimpses of the future that was opening before them; and in the unity of material interests and the common principle they had given birth to, and consecrated with their blood, they began to recognize the obligation of a common duty to humanity. They then saw clearly the necessity of an organization capable of protecting those interests, and securing forever to the race the rights for which, with a common devotion, they had all fought. Then rising, with the dignity of the duty, above their European ideas of government, their local prejudices and petty ambitions, the *thirteen sovereign states*, surrendering all hopes of independent power and greatness, magnanimously sacrificed their sovereignties on the altar of a common Nationality, dedicated to the cause of human freedom. Nor did they stop here. To make the sacrifice still more sublime and forever irrevocable, they refused to recognize that their former sovereignties had ever existed, and proclaimed to the world, "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this CONSTITUTION for the United States of America."

That was the spirit in which our fathers, under the guidance of a far-reaching foresight, akin to inspiration, organized

our government and adapted it to the work of subduing the continent, and developing its unlimited sources of wealth and physical power, in order only to make them contribute to the fulfillment of its higher and holier duty of securing to every man, over whom its flag floats, the freest and fullest development of all his faculties, and establishing here the most perfect civilization of which the race is capable. And they made it strong enough to do all this, and yet reserved to the states power enough to prevent the possibility of its ever defeating the high end for which, under God, they had created it.

It was the ushering into the astonished family of nations of such a government, recognizing such principles and with such resources of power to enforce them, that so clearly and sharply defined the character of this new epoch, *the manhood of the race*, as to place it far above and beyond all that had preceded it. The destiny of man then took such a stride onward that the whole earth shook beneath its majestic tread; for

> "When a deed is done for Freedom, through the broad earth's aching breast
> Runs a thrill of joy prophetic, trembling on from East to West;
> And the slave, where'er he cowers, feels the soul within him climb
> To the awful verge of manhood, as the energy sublime
> Of a century bursts full-blossom'd on the thorny stem of Time.
> Through the walls of hut and palace shoots the instantaneous throe,
> When the travail of the ages wings earth's systems to and fro;
> At the birth of each new era, with a recognizing start,
> Nation wildly looks at nation, standing with mute lips apart,
> And glad Truth's yet mightier man-child leaps beneath the Future's heart."

France was the first to feel the trembling vibrations of the new impulse across the sea, and:

> "The brute despair of trampled centuries
> Leap'd up with one hoarse yell and snapp'd its bands,
> Groped for its right with horny, callous hands,
> And stared around for God with blood-shot eyes."

It was but anarchy and crime that, in her blindness, she mistook for the freedom she had dreamed of in her dull and troubled sleep; and, like a child, soon tiring of this bloody plaything, she cast it away for the glittering bauble of Napoleon's glory. But such a live, free nation, like ours, cannot exist in the world without still, at times, making the pulsations of its great strong heart felt across the ocean. It is then that

the crushed and besotted peoples of Europe start wildly from their leaden sleep, and groping, like a blind giant, for the pillars of despotism, only bury their own hopes under the ruin they make.

The feebleness and fruitlessness of these pregnant convulsions, as well as all the experience of history, teach us this important lesson: that, as new wine cannot be put into old bottles—as the vigor of youth cannot be infused into the palsied limbs of age—so the vital principle of a new civilization cannot be galvanized into the withered forms of the old. The doctrine of self-government is too vital and powerful an element of progress to be compressed into the effete systems of Europe. It requires new and higher social and political forms to embody it; a wider theater, with grander scenery and a new set of actors, for its representation. This idea of a government created by the people and for the people, is adapted only to the manhood of the race; and can only be fully realized on this continent, by this form of government and by this great American race, formed by the assimilation with the Anglo-Saxon of all the best blood of all the historic nations, and educated by the lessons of all past history, and disciplined by the stern experience of its own career, up to the comprehension of its power and its duty.

But above and over all the influences shaping and determining our national career, controlling and vitalizing them all, is Christianity. Freed from the corrupting influences of government, which had made it the instrument of oppression; and the senseless mummeries and lifeless forms which had cramped and perverted it, it has here the opportunity to accomplish the mission for which its Divine Founder intended it. Wrested from the control of a bigoted hierarchy, it here becomes the common heritage of the people; and instead of the handmaid of slavery, it becomes the bulwark of liberty. Combining in its doctrines all the fragments of truth that lie scattered through all history—uniting the idea of the *infinite* and the *finite*, *divinity* and *humanity* in the office and person of Christ—it becomes the sublimed expression of the *philosophy* as well as the *religion*, the *reason* as well as the *faith*, of this *third* and *last* phase of historical development. It was only when, through religious freedom, the masses of the people

were taught to comprehend fully the meaning of this great central idea of Christianity, the union of the divine and the human, and to recognize in Christ the true type of all human perfection, and consequently the true dignity and immortal destiny of man, that a government based on the essential equality of all men, and their inherent right, in virtue alone of their manhood and their responsibility to God, to be free, became possible. Thus we find that spiritual always precedes and begets social and political freedom. It was only when Luther had unlocked the Bible, and the printing-press had given it to the people, that the essential living principles of Christianity sank down into the hearts of the masses and awakened the desire for civil liberty. It was freedom to worship God, above all else, that our fathers sought for in the New World. The idea of religious liberty was the germ they planted in the wilderness, and watered with their tears and their blood, until it grew and blossomed and bore the rich fruit of social and political equality.

Thus we see how the uniform tendency of the forces of nature, the great outlines of the continents, the characteristics of the races, the grand march of history through the ages, and above all, the sublime doctrines of Christianity, all conspire to teach us the importance of our high position, as well as the magnitude of our responsibility as a nation.

The question now forces itself upon us, and we could not evade it if we would, have we, as a people, comprehended the *lesson*, or met the *responsibility?* Have we not rather forgotten the universal law of moral compensation, as applicable to nations as to individuals, that the richer the blessings the higher the duty; and while enjoying our blessings have we not forgotten our duty? Have we not forgotten that, in making us "the heirs of all the ages," God intended to exact of us in return the most heroic performance and the most generous sacrifice for the principles of eternal right and justice that any nation was ever required to pay? These are questions which four years ago the nation impiously thrust aside as fanatical, and even treasonable, but which God is now thundering into its ears from the brazen throat of the cannon, and it cannot help but hear. By the flashes of the lightning that gleams from this fearful thunder-cloud of war, we can now see the

frightful precipice on which we stood, and look shuddering into the abyss of utter ruin into which another step would have plunged us; and by the glare of the same light, we can now look back over the slimy path of compromise and concession to wrong down which we basely crawled to the very brink of destruction. We, who would not listen to the silent admonitions of conscience, nor learn the lessons of nature and history, cannot help but read this terrible *curse* written in blood wherever we turn:

"Because ye have broken your own chain,
With the strain
Of brave men climbing a nation's height,
Yet thence bear down with brand and thong
On the souls of others, for this *wrong*
This is the curse.

Because yourselves are standing straight
In the state
Of Freedom's foremost acolyte,
Yet keep calm footing all the time
On writhing bond-slaves, for this *crime*
This is the curse.

Because ye prosper in God's name,
With a claim
To honor in the old world's sight,
Yet do the fiend's work perfectly
In strangling martyrs, for this *lie*
This is the curse."

God is now only exacting, in the form of a bloody retribution, what we refused to pay in faithfulness to the responsibilities of our high position, and it is a fearful penalty we are paying; yet it is God's price, high as it is, for what we basely bartered away in the past. But life and money are cheaper commodities than principle; and we may be thankful if we can cancel the debts of the past and secure our national integrity for the future at the immense cost of blood and treasure we are now paying. It will be cheap even at that price.

As, in the human body, the chemical forces of dead matter, while under the control of the vital principle, work together harmoniously to build up and sustain the living organism, but when the vitality has left it, go to work, like vandals, to pull down the structure they had reared, and resolve it into its

original dust, so under the control of the vitalizing, harmonizing principle of liberty and equality, the independent sovereign states combined together to build up the beautiful fabric of our government; but when the hideous vampire of slavery had sucked the life-blood of the nation, until there was scarcely virtue enough left to resist its impious demands, then the disintegrating elements of state sovereignty, which our fathers repudiated, began to tear to pieces the fair form they had helped to create. And so far had the work of disintegration gone, that the head of this great nation was forced, by the traitors in the cabinet, to declare, in his *official capacity*, that the government had no power "to coerce a state into obedience to its authority;" that this young republic, for which all history has been a preparation, with its work before it scarcely begun, had not vitality enough to save it from falling to pieces. So completely had the piratical crew dismantled the ship of state, that, amid the howling of the storm, the man at the helm was heard, in whining tones, proclaiming that there was not strength enough left in the "old hulk" to hold its planks together. No wonder that the stoutest hearts quailed before the dangers of that dark hour, and patriots gazed with mute despair into the threatening gloom of the future! But God did not mean to destroy us. Even in the last extremity deliverance came. The pirates, who were madly driving us on the breakers, were hurled overboard, and now, with a loyal crew and a firm, unflinching hand at the helm, the old ship has righted; and as she gallantly rides the heaving billows, the sun-light breaks through the rifts in the thunder-cloud, with the assurance that she will yet weather the storm, and bring her rich freight of human hopes safe into port at last!

God means to save us; but he means to try us by fire. All that is ruthless and wicked in us will be burned up; but all that is worth saving in us will only be purer and better for the fierce ordeal. God intends to make us fit for the work he put us here to do; and to make us willing to do it. As the duty is noble to which we are called, so the chastisement that is to prepare us for it is severe; nor will it end until our repentance is thorough. But already the nation, from the depths of its humility, is looking anxiously toward Heaven

inquiring, "What must we do to be saved?" Already the paralyzed and deadened national heart begins to show signs of life; and the first effort of its returning vitality is to throw off this virus of slavery, and bring itself into sympathy with the great living heart of humanity. Already we have learned that devotion to the principles of truth and justice is worth more than "all the wealth that sinews bought and sold have ever earned," and as we begin to fall in with the grand, ever-flowing current of God's providence, cheering signs of promise are given to us;

> "While down the happy Future runs a flood
> Of prophesying light:
> It shows an Earth no longer stain'd with blood;
> Blossom and fruit where now we see the bud
> Of Brotherhood and Right."

## Art. II.—BOSSUET AS A PERSECUTOR.

Among the eminent men who have graced the pulpit of Roman Catholic France, there is none whose name is better known, outside of his own Church, as well as within it, than Jaques Bénigne Bossuet. This rare distinction is not the result of accident. The acute intellect, which revealed its great capacities to the instructors of his youth, and induced the Jesuit fathers of Dijon to make strenuous but unsuccessful efforts to gain him for their order, was allied to oratorical powers of the very first rank. As a boy, he was distinguished for his assiduity and proficiency; and in the college of Navarre, where he pursued his studies for the priesthood, he was recognized as the most promising scholar of his day. Undoubtedly the influence of the ancient and respectable Burgundian family from which he sprang, had something to do with his early advancement; but it was the beauty of his style that delighted the literary men of his times; it was the grace of his delivery that rendered him a favorite with the despotic monarch of France and his courtiers; it was the elegance and force of his address that entranced the multitudes who followed him around from church

to church in the metropolis. Thus everything conspired to promote his elevation. Within the space of a few years, from being a simple canon of the cathedral of Metz, we find him appointed to preach lenten sermons before Louis the Fourteenth, next nominated to the bishopric of Condom, then selected to be preceptor to the dauphin, and finally settled in the episcopal see of Meaux, in the immediate vicinity of Paris, to be called frequently to assist the king by his counsels.

Whatever may be thought at the present day of the merits of his Universal History, it will be conceded by all that he was peculiarly adapted to the part which he so frequently assumed as a controversialist. From his dispute with Fénélon he came off with the appearance of victory; and among all the champions of the Roman Catholic side there was no one but Bossuet who could make even a respectable opposition to the surpassing eloquence of the great Claude. No one knew how to present an argument in a more specious guise; and his printed works bear as unmistakable testimony to this, as the traditions of his skillful evasions in oral controversies. His "History of the Variations of the Protestants" is even now a favorite weapon in the hands of the advocates of the Roman Church, and more than one really critical mind, to say nothing of the multitudes who are ever easy dupes of ingenious fallacies, has been attracted by it, for a time at least, to the pretended Mother Church as that in which alone true unity can be found. By no writer have the inconsistencies of doctrine of the representative men of the various Protestant Churches, and their contests with one another, and deplorable want of charity for the supposed errors of brethren with whom they nevertheless agree in the essential points of the Christian faith, been employed more effectively to exhibit the perils attending individual and independent inquiry, in contrast with the safety of the adherents of ecclesiastical tradition.

But it is neither with Bossuet as the debater and writer on points of theological controversy, nor yet with Bossuet as representative of the Gallican Church and defender of its liberties against the usurpations of the papal see, in the famous declaration of the French clergy in 1682, that we have here to do. It is rather Bossuet in his diocese, Bossuet as Bishop of Meaux, in his relations to the poor Huguenots, whom we propose to

consider in the light which history has recently thrown upon his course from the time of his enthronization to within a year or two of his death.

The period which comprises the active career of Bossuet is one of the most remarkable in French history; and, as it has since appeared, one of the most disastrous in its consequences. The latter half of the sixteenth century had witnessed a series of civil wars, with intermissions that could be viewed as little better than truces, (since they were mainly spent by both parties in the recuperation of their wasted strength,) which had carried devastation and ruin into every province of the kingdom. The century had closed after the proclamation of an edict of toleration, on the basis of which, had it been adopted forty years earlier, all the commotions and bloodshed of the intervening period might easily have been precluded. The Edict of Nantes, intended by the sagacious Henry IV. as a perpetual and fundamental law, secured to Protestantism in France, not equality in the enjoyment of the rights of the profession of their faith and of worship with Roman Catholics, but a toleration sufficiently broad to prevent the repetition of those horrid butcheries which disgraced the French name in the age of the Reformation, and the liberty to perform their solemnities in those places in the neighborhood of which they constituted an important element of the population. But the seventeenth century presents us the familiar story of the gradual infringement upon privileges, whose direct abrogation is avoided for the time as impracticable, and is delayed until everything is ripe for the long-anticipated catastrophe. Slowly but surely the Protestants are deprived of their rights as French citizens. Their worship is restricted to a smaller number of places. They are excluded from places of trust and emolument; they are looked upon by the government with an unfriendly eye; they can hope for no preferment in the civil or military service of the monarch, even after renewed demonstrations of their loyalty have been afforded. Every facility is furnished to those who would enter their midst to seduce them from their devotion to the Church of their fathers. Upon the slightest pretexts their children are torn away from their firesides, and they themselves subjected to the penalties of apostasy. It was a course of gradual disenfranchisement, which was not complete

until within fifteen years of the close of the century. Meanwhile the law could scarcely keep pace with the successive steps of this ingenious persecution. Edict rapidly followed edict, the whole constituting a voluminous and cumbrous legislation—a hundred-headed monster that should at every point confront the adherents of the "*religion prétendue réformée*," as it was contemptuously styled, and weary out their constancy of purpose. The device of enforcing conversion by quartering a rude and insolent soldiery upon a peaceable portion of the population, and conniving at its most flagrant crimes, proved successful in many cases where the inducements held out to tempt ambition and the love of wealth had been found ineffectual. The results were magnified by the cunning projectors of these enterprises, while the means employed were as much as possible screened from view; until at length the French king was brought to believe that the plans of his advisers had been crowned with such entire success, that the conversion of the Huguenots, which had been too difficult a problem for his predecessors, had actually been accomplished, constituting the most glorious achievement of his reign. The very preamble of the edict of revocation, which consigned to expatriation the most industrious part of the French nation, numbering, according to one account, eight hundred thousand souls, bases this action upon the uselessness of retaining the Edict of Nantes in force, the royal exertions having accomplished what they had proposed, and "the *greater part* of our subjects of the said pretended Reformed religion having embraced the Catholic religion!"

It was while the Protestants of France were thus being stripped of one right after another, and about four years previous to the final blow, that Bossuet was, in 1681, installed as bishop of Meaux. He was, therefore, of necessity, involved to some extent in relation to the work which the court had undertaken. The city of Meaux was one of the capital points of the reformation in France. It was among the wool-carders of Meaux that the Gospel achieved its first victories under the temporary protection of Briçonnet, the vacillating prelate. At Meaux Jean Leclerc was the first to suffer the perforation of his tongue with hot iron and branding on the forehead, for the boldness with which he tore down a papal bull, and sub-

stituted an answer of his own; and it was the same fearless citizen of Meaux who, a few months later, was destined to be the French protomartyr in behalf of evangelical truth. Passing over an interval of more than twenty years, the history of Huguenot sufferings is illustrated by the intrepid deaths of the famous "Fourteen of Meaux." And the Church, cemented with the blood of these and other brave defenders of the truth, had not fallen into ruins when Bossuet entered the episcopal palace.*

How did Bossuet discharge his office, and what, in particular, was his conduct toward the members of the Reformed Church in his diocese?

The Cardinal de Bausset, the biographer of Bossuet, gives the following answer to this question:

It may well be supposed that we have felt extreme interest in investigating whether Bossuet had been consulted with respect to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. If any bishop of France must have been, it was certainly Bossuet, and yet everything persuades us that he was not. We have found nothing in his papers, nor in those of Abbé Ledieu, that can even give us a glimpse of his having been called to deliberate on this great measure; and it is impossible to suppose that if he had taken the slightest part in it, he would not have let some mark escape to meet the eyes of the Abbé Ledieu, who is so attentive in gathering up his words, so exact in relating them to us.... Without daring to presume to conjecture what would have been Bossuet's advice, had Louis XIV. asked him for it, it can only be asserted with confidence, that all the difficulties which arose immediately after the revocation prove evidently that Bossuet was not consulted.... We sincerely think that Bossuet has just claims to the esteem of Protestants. He combated their doctrines, he deplored their errors, he *alleviated their sufferings, he protested against the laws that oppressed them, he never persecuted a single one of them*, he was the stay, the consolation and the benefactor of all that invoked his name, his genius, and his virtues. There does not exist a particle of evidence to show that Bossuet took part in what immediately preceded or followed the Revocation. *He never asked of the king a single act of rigor against a single Protestant.*

So also the Abbé Guettée remarks:

It must be said to the glory of Bossuet that, while approving in principle the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, far from being

* So signal has been the failure of persecution to effect the destruction of Protestantism here, that, in 1861, (according to the *Annuaire Protestant Statisque et Historique*,) the Consistorial Church of Meaux comprised six parishes with seven dependencies, seven pastors, and thirteen churches and chapels.

accessory to the cruelties, he was not even an abettor of certain acts of violence which other bishops regarded as necessary.*

We shall presently see whether this language is borne out by official documents still preserved. Meanwhile let us notice that the terms in which Bossuet eulogizes the revocation in his funeral oration in honor of Chancellor Le Tellier are strangely inconsistent with this view. He calls upon the annalist of the Church to place Louis with Constantine and Theodosius. He exalts an act which had brought back heretics, until the churches were too strait to receive them, while their false teachers had abandoned them, and sought safety in flight. He styles it "*the most beautiful exercise of authority.*" He apostrophizes "this new Constantine, this new Theodosius, this new Marcian, this new Charlemagne" in these words: "You have confirmed the faith, you have exterminated the heretics; this is *the worthy labor of your reign*, it is its proper character!" And the Jesuit De La Rue, addressing Bossuet, attributes the honor of the act to the bishop himself: "In God's name, who gave you, my lord, the strength to *commence this holy revolution*, employ all the light, the ardor, and the credit you possess, to see with your own eyes the end and perfection *of your work.*"

Even during the lifetime of the bishop of Meaux, there were not wanting those who accused him of being an active participant in the persecution of the Huguenots. In particular, one Pierre Frotté, a former canon of the abbey of St. Geneviève, and curate of the parish of Souilly, in the diocese of Meaux, became a Protestant, and flying for safety to Holland, published a narrative of his conversion, which gave a very different view of Bossuet's course from that which the prelate himself sought to circulate, and which his friends have insisted upon as correct, and have apparently endeavored to perpetuate by the suppression or destruction of papers in conflict with it. We shall have a few words more to say respecting the testimony of this priest, who seems to have enjoyed the best means of information, in consequence of his intimate association with his bishop; and who asserts that, with the exception of a single woman of bad character, who perhaps abjured voluntarily, all the rest of

* "Il ne fut jamais partisan non-seulement des cruautés, mais de certaines violences que d'autres évêques regardaient comme nécessaires."

the Protestants of the diocese of Meaux that joined the Roman Catholic Church, did it only through fear of the soldiery whom Bossuet caused to pass and repass through their midst, during the time of his missions, and in consequence of threats which he uttered even in his sermons against the contumacious.

The French Protestant Historical Society, among the many important documents which it has published within the fourteen years of its existence, has inserted in its bulletin a number of ministerial dispatches and other papers relating to Bossuet, hitherto buried in the archives of the French empire. Although much that would have thrown additional light upon the subject, and especially Bossuet's own letters, appears to have been carefully eliminated, the following facts appear.

*First.* Bossuet is seen in the light of an informer against Protestants suspected of being engaged in making preparations to leave the kingdom. It is well known that the greatest precautions were adopted to prevent the emigration of members of the Reformed Church, or of the "New Catholics" (Nouveax Catholiques,) as, by a legal fiction, they were styled. The frontiers were guarded with vigilance, and those who were detected in the act of escaping from the kingdom were punished with hard labor in the galleys, if men, and with confiscation and imprisonment, if women.* It was only by the employment of practiced guides at exorbitant prices, and in disguise, that most of the refugees succeeded in reaching a country where freedom of conscience was guaranteed. Not only were the goods of the emigrants declared to be confiscated to the crown, but all conveyances of property made by them within a year previous to their departure were null and void. The part of a Christian bishop, under such circumstances, would seem to be to alleviate, rather than aggravate, the hardships to which enactments like these exposed the Huguenots. But in the year 1688 we find Bossuet engaged in denouncing to the government the intentions of some of the

* Mrs. Maury, in her translation of the Edict of Revocation, given in the appendix to her interesting "Memoirs of a Huguenot Family, translated and compiled from the original autobiography of Rev. James Fontaine," (New York, 1853, page 510,) has accidentally omitted from the tenth article its most essential clause, the prohibition to leave the kingdom. In the original this article reads: "Faisons très expresses et itératives défenses à tous nos sujets de ladite R. P. R. de sortir: eux, leurs femmes et enfans de notredit Royaume, Pais et Terres de notre obéissance," etc.

Reformed. "Sir," writes the minister on the 14th of April, to M. de Mesnars, Intendant of the Generality of Paris, under whose government the city of Meaux was placed, "the Bishop of Meaux having written to me that there is some movement among the New Catholics of his diocese, who are selling their furniture and seem to be preparing to leave the kingdom, letting it even be understood that they are taking away their children with them, I reported it to the king, who commanded me to notify you of it, in order that you may examine whether this rumor has any foundation, and may give such orders as you deem necessary, according to the circumstances."*

*Secondly.* Perhaps the most oppressive article in the edict of revocation, was that which prescribed that the children of Protestants should be baptized by the curates of the parish in which they resided, and be brought up in the "Apostolic and Roman Catholic religion."† In the recently discovered documents, Bossuet figures in the unenviable light of an informer against the parents who refused or neglected to send their children to be instructed in what they considered abominable error. "After having given an account to the king," writes the minister to Bossuet, April 30th, 1686, "of what you wrote to me on the subject of the children of the newly-converted of your diocese, whom the parents neglect to send to the schools and to the instructions that are given in the parishes, his majesty has resolved to write on this subject to the intendants, to direct them to oblige the parents to send them thither, and you may act in concert with M. de Mesnars in reference to everything which there may be to be done in this respect in your diocese."‡

*Thirdly.* We find Bossuet still more frequently either the advocate of the summary arrest of Protestants, with a view to compelling them to abjure their faith, or accessory to it. On the 2d of April, 1686, a ministerial command is sent to M. de Mesnars revoking an order for the arrest of a father and his son who had been converted; and the reason assigned for the revocation is "because the order was issued only on account of their religion, *at the prayer of the Bishop of Meaux.*"§ Thir-

* Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, IV, 118.

† Article VIII. ‡ Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Hist. du Prot. Français, IV, 117.

§ Ib. ubi supra; "à la prière de M. l'évesque de Meaux."

teen years later, (July 5th, 1699,) Friar Leonard, of St. Catharine of Sienna, jots down the following incident:

Two heads of families of the city of Meaux, in very moderate circumstances, wrote to their bishop a few days ago that they still had many doubts on some doctrinal points, and principally on that of purgatory. That prelate sent for them, and tried to prove the doctrine to them by the best reasons he could allege. But as they did not appear satisfied by them, and would not promise their bishop to change their sentiments, he sent and *had them arrested* two days after by an order from the king, and they were taken to the prison of the Conciergerie of this city, where they are being instructed. This has obliged the prelate to compose a book to prove that there is a purgatory, and, as he is very learned, no doubt is entertained that this book, on which he is laboring at the present moment, will be well written.*

Again, on the 7th of July, 1703, about nine months before his death, Bossuet received this note from the government:

I have sent the order *which you ask for*, to have the man named Baudouin and his wife, bad Catholics of Fublaines, imprisoned in the hospital. M. Phelypeaux writes to me that this order had been granted to you a month since by the king, but I had heard nothing of it. Apparently you had given no memorandum of it to his majesty.†

These instances, selected from a number, will sufficiently exhibit Bossuet's participation in the arrests of those who either refused to abjure, or, after their conversion to the Roman Catholic Church, betrayed by their remissness in attending upon its ordinances, the insincerity of their profession.

*Fourthly.* We find Bossuet, within one week after the promulgation of the edict of revocation, begging and obtaining (October 29th, 1685) the demolition of the Protestant churches of Nanteuil and Morcerf, for the erection of hospitals at Meaux. A few days later the adjoining houses are also granted him at his request. Encouraged by these largesses of the crown, in 1699 he asks that the property of a Protestant absentee be given him to be applied to the expenses incurred for the instruction of the New Catholics; but the request is refused, on the ground that no civil judgment had been pronounced in the case.‡

*Fifthly.* Bossuet is now discovered to have been privy to, and undoubtedly the instigator of the persecution of two young

* MS. in the Imperial Archives, vol. M., 1802, reprinted in Bulletin IV, 221.
† Ib. IV, 222. ‡ Ib. IV, 116, 220, 221.

Protestant orphans born within the limits of his diocese, of which we already possessed accounts in Benoît's History of the Edict of Nantes, and, in greater detail, in a rare printed volume of contemporary date.* The three letters which establish this point are accompanied by the official *procès-verbal* of the examination of the girls, a document fully corroborating all the incidents of this atrocious proceeding, and affixing new marks of infamy to all that were directly or remotely connected with it. The story is briefly this. In the village of La-Ferté-sous-Jouarre there lived an honest man, in comfortable circumstances, named Pierre Mirat, who, some twenty years before the publication of the edict of revocation, had been converted from the Roman Catholic to the Reformed Church. At his death his children were confided to the care of their mother, who, although a well-meaning woman, through her absorption in worldly cares allowed them to remain in such ignorance, that when she died her two youngest daughters could neither read nor write. Both their Romanist and their Protestant relatives were desirous of securing to the young girls a guardian of their own creed. Happily the choice fell on a Protestant uncle, under whose roof they remained for three months undisturbed. Meanwhile the Roman Catholic relatives determined, if possible, to break up this arrangement, and finally induced the king's attorney at Meaux, who hoped to make some money by the affair, as we are told, to give an order that the children should be delivered to him, to be placed in the Ursuline convent a few leagues distant from Meaux. When it was found that there was no resource to avoid compliance, the guardian and his Protestant friends employed the brief interval allowed them in endeavoring to instruct the girls and fortify their courage for the rough trial that awaited them. But although they gave the strongest assurances of their constancy, yet, from their ignorance and child-like timidity, little hope resulted. The project of the Romanist relatives was, however, delayed by the jealousy of the bailiff of the village of La-Ferté, who, disputing the jurisdiction of the attorney of Meaux, removed the children from their guardian's hands, and placed them in other custody. After the archers

* Réflexions sur la cruelle persécution que souffre l'Eglise Reformée le France, etc., 1686. In Bulletin, tome X, pp. 50–66.

sent from Meaux had taken vengeance upon the innocent Protestant relatives, and pending a decision of the Parisian court of parliament upon the question of jurisdiction, a formal examination of the children was held before the king's attorney and lieutenant-general of Meaux, with the view of learning their choice of religion.* The official record recently brought to light confirms the previously known statements of their remarkable constancy. Mary Mirat, only eleven years of age, answered to the interrogatories, "that she wished to belong to the religion in which her father and mother departed this life, and that she would not change, even if she must be put to death for it," "without being able to tell us," adds the record, "whether she thought or if she knew that there was any other religion than hers, saying, on the contrary, that she did not care whether there was any other, and being unable to tell us in any other way what her religion was." Magdalen, two years younger, when asked if she knew the reason for which she was summoned, said "that it was to ask her whether she would go to mass, which she would not do, because she wished to die in the religion in which her father and mother had died, and that she would never change." Equally sagacious with her sister, Magdalen declined to define her religion, thus avoiding a theological controversy above her years, in which her examiners would gladly have entangled her; nor would she admit that her answers were prompted by any of her relatives; "c'estoit le bon Dieu qui lui avoit dit.†

Foiled in this attempt to entrap the little girls, the first president of the Parisian parliament was induced by the Roman Catholic relatives, before the rendering of a judicial decision, to give them an order to take charge of the children. This was executed with promptness. The children, hurried into a carriage, flung themselves against the doors and cut their arms with the glass in their frantic attempts to escape. The compassionate abbess of a convent to which they were first taken, refused to receive them when she saw their grief. One of their

* An edict of the king, framed in order to facilitate conversions to the popular religion, permitted the children of Protestants, at the age of seven years, to choose to become Roman Catholics, independently of the wish of their parents and other relatives.

† See the interesting document in the Bulletin of the French Protestant Historical Society for 1860, tom. IX, pp. 65, seq.

relatives then carried them bound on a cart to his own house, where for several months they were subjected to the most annoying persecution, and plied by all the arts of priests, monks, and nuns. A Benedictine monk even read them a forged letter from their Protestant aunts, in which they announced their own conversion to the mother Church; but the sensible children, instead of distressing themselves about the truth of the story, replied "that their aunts might, if they pleased, go to perdition, but that as for themselves, they had a soul to save, and that nothing in the world would turn them aside from the way in which they were, being persuaded that in it they would infallibly find their salvation." At length they managed to escape from the house, and betook themselves to the house of their guardian, a distance of nine or ten miles. To avoid difficulty they were brought before the first president of the parliament, where again they witnessed a good profession, by their constancy saving a poor Protestant who heard them from carrying into execution the purpose he had formed to abjure his faith. The president now proposed to place the children in a convent for a few days, in order to test the truth of the accusation made against the Protestant relatives, that they deterred the girls from professing Catholicism. The guardian consented; but the president did not keep his promise to restore them in two weeks if they remained firm, and to guarantee them mild treatment. In their new place of confinement they were again assailed by promises and threats, and, when neither would shake their determination, severer measures were resorted to. Embracing a favorable opportunity the children once more planned an escape, and, scaling a high garden-wall, fled to Paris. There they remained concealed for nearly a year, until they were enabled to pass into Holland, where they at length found a safe refuge.

This is but one of a thousand similar cases that occurred in connection with the persecuting ordinances of Louis the Fourteenth. Benoit, with his accustomed conscientiousness, abstains from uttering even a suspicion that the Bishop of Meaux was concerned in it. Yet such, it can now be proved, was the fact. Three letters relating to the case of the Mirat children have come to light, signed by the same king's attorney to whom reference has been made, and dated within a few days of each

other, in the month of April, 1683, and in each reference is made to the Bishop of Meaux as a principal actor. In the first, which incloses the memorandum of the examination of the children, M. Margudet-Delanoue, king's attorney, says, "*My lord the Bishop of Meaux has intrusted me with a note to hand to you upon this subject.*"* In the second he tells the minister, "I will not fail to continue, if it be agreeable to you, and *as my lord the Bishop of Meaux commands me.*"† And in the third, written after the girls had been placed in the hands of their Roman Catholic relations, he adds: "My lord the Bishop of Meaux has charged me with the herewith inclosed letter, and has *commanded me to append the documents which I send you.*"‡ Could any evidence demonstrate more conclusively that the king's attorney, from the beginning to the end, was acting simply at the direction of Bossuet, whom, as bishop of the place, and all-powerful at court, the civil magistrate consulted on every point with the most obsequious deference?

We have said enough to show that Bossuet, far from opposing the sanguinary persecution which culminated in the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, was zealous in its enforcement, both before and after 1685. If in 1686, in his pastoral letter of March 24th, he boasted that none of the Protestants that had been converted "had suffered any violence, either in their person or in their goods," "that they came back peaceably," and calls upon them to testify to it, we have found the assertion to be baseless and false. And this has been proved without the assistance of the numerous cases of individuals subjected to severe persecution related by the Abbé Frotté, whose narrative might appear less credible if unsupported by documentary evidence.§

* Monseigneur l'evesque de Meaux m'a chargé d'une note pour vous faire tenir sur ce sujet. Letter in Bulletin de la Soc., etc., IX, 65.

† Ainsi que Monseigneur l'évesque de Meaux *me l'ordonne.* Ibid. IX, 70.

‡ Monseigneur l'evesque de Meaux m'a chargé de la lettre cy-incluse, et *m'a ordonné* d'y, joindre les pièces que je vous envoie. Ib. IX, 71.

§ Among the instances mentioned by Frotté, upon which the official documents have shed new light, is that of an aged and dying man named Cochard, whom the bishop finally succeeded in persuading to abjure Protestantism, among other violent threats telling him, "that as soon as he was dead he would be thrown into the sewer like a dog!" See Frotté's Letter, Bulletin de la Soc., etc., for April, 1864, 97–112.

70620

Whence comes, then, the strange inconsistency between the tolerant expressions of opinion and conduct of Bossuet's earlier life and the cruel conduct of its last two decades? The Abbé Frotté sufficiently explains the phenomenon:

While I am engaged in making my confessions to you, I will acknowledge that what has still further contributed to my conversion, has been, that it appears that your entire zeal for the Romish religion is simple policy, and a great passion to please the court, where you have great obligations and great hopes. When the court bade you to sustain the infallibility of the pope, you would have anathematized all who disputed that imaginary privilege; when it commanded you to dispute it, you at once stripped him of it; and we see you quite ready to re-invest him with it, at the first order you receive. But this is common to you with others; I prefer to speak of what is peculiarly your own. Before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the Bishop of Meaux was not so vigorous a preacher against the Reformed; but since the court has explained that it will tolerate in France only the Romish religion, and since the persecution of the Protestants has become fashionable, the Bishop of Meaux appears at the head of furious converters and the most cruel persecutors. Yet on God's side, you always have the same obligations to labor for the salvation of the people of your diocese; but you give this care to your vicars when it is only God that commands you, and you work yourself only when obedience to an earthly king and his favor are in question. Then only you make it a point of honor to succeed promptly. For what would be said at court, if the Bishop of Meaux, who has such excellent talents for persuading, did not hasten the conversion of the Reformed more than did the rest?

It was a difficult task for a French bishop in the seventeenth century, and especially for a prelate so fond of human applause and of the short-lived favor of courts as was Jaques Bénigne Bossuet, to set up his own opinion in opposition to that of the self-willed monarch, and attempt to stay, at least in his own diocese, the persecution inaugurated under the auspices of the Pères La Chaise and the Maintenons. Bossuet made no attempt to gain, by any such resistance, the credit of singularity. But a yet more terrible alternative confronted the ecclesiastical dignitary who attempted to carry out the royal plan. The primitive Church used the utmost circumspection in admitting new converts to its sacred ordinances. It insisted on a period of probation, and barred its doors to those suspected of complicity with paganism or heresy. Not so the modern bishop. "On the contrary," says a writer of the times,

"with arms in hand, he forces those whom he must believe, according to his own principles, to be heretics, schismatics and profane, not only to enter his church, but even to eat what he asserts to be the veritable body and blood of Jesus Christ. According to his own doctrine, he gives to dogs the most sacred and holy thing upon the face of the earth. As Pilate delivered Jesus Christ to the Jews through fear of Cæsar, Monsieur de Meaux delivers Jesus Christ to his enemies through complaisance for his prince. When these heretics, I say, have in their profane mouths the Saviour of the world, they will be able to insult him with the words of that same Pilate and to say, 'I have power over thee; thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me.'" "In truth, sir," adds the same writer, "this conduct, approved by almost all the bishops, your associates, ought at once to put an end to all religious disputes. It is an epitome of controversy very easy of comprehension by all who possess even a small share of good sense and reflection."

The bitter irony of the Abbé Frotté was but too well deserved. It was not long before the clergy of France, awaking from the delirium of joy which their first apparent success had produced, began to appreciate the depth of the abyss into which they had unwittingly plunged. They were filling their churches with heretics, with Crypto-Protestants, with enemies in disguise. A candid and serious parish priest confessed to Jaques Fontaine that he trembled for the future of his country, and feared lest the Almighty would send upon it, in consequence of the impious course pursued, war, famine, and pestilence; and the Huguenot confessor saw within his own days the fulfillment of the dire prophecy.* A subsequent age has beheld a result more dreadful and enduring, the growth of infidelity, restless and unprincipled, sapping the foundations of morals, unsettling the social fabric, making instability the rule and a firmly established constitution the exception. For this result Bossuet and his fellow-bishops, who enforced hypocrisy at the point of the sword, are in no small degree accountable. And they failed to crush Protestantism in France. After passing through a century more of cruel persecution, its adherents are scarcely less numerous to-day than before the French prelates undertook

* Memoirs of a Huguenot Family, p. 103.

their impracticable task; while the multitudes that succeeded in escaping, in spite of their severe edicts, strengthened the hands of the Protestants of Germany and the Low Countries, gave a new impulse to the growing manufactures of Protestant England, and contributed to secure the predominance of Protestantism on this western continent.

---

## Art. III.—HERMENEUTICS AND HOMILETICS;

### OR, THE STUDY OF THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES AND PREACHING.

[ARTICLE FIRST.]

### § 1. Introduction.

Our young men, candidates for the ministry, who are to be the future pastors and teachers of the Church, should covet earnestly a knowledge of the original Scriptures. Very few would object to this statement as a general truth, and yet when we come to make an individual application of it, many will begin to excuse themselves, and will point out some very eminent and very useful ministers who have never known the first words of the original Scriptures. Perhaps they will say, also, that some who have acquired a tolerable facility in reading the original Scriptures, do not use it, and that many go from our colleges and divinity schools, and if they do not actually *sell* their Hebrew Bibles and Greek Testaments, they let them stand upon the shelves of their libraries to gather the dust of weeks and even months, if not of years. But all this proves nothing more than that laziness and depravity may still inhere in a man whose office, advantages, piety, and love for Christ and for souls, should stimulate him to do better. A minister who neglects the opportunity of becoming well versed in the original Scripture, fails to secure one of the highest attainments for usefulness in his vocation. Indeed, we claim for this attainment the first place in importance, as a human qualification, for the work of the Gospel. It is only secondary to the divine gift of the Holy Spirit.

## § 2. Relative Value to the Preacher of Knowledge and Eloquence.

Of Apollos it is said, "He was an eloquent man, [λόγιος, a wordy man,] and *mighty in the Scriptures*, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. Acts xviii, 24.

In a sermon the two great points to be secured are, first, the subject; secondly, the presentation of that subject. The first implies a knowledge of the Scriptures, the second, skill in presenting the subject. With the thoughtful hearer, *what* a minister preaches is of more importance than the manner of his delivery: by the ignorant and superficial, the manner is more regarded.

Neither Moses, the leading preacher under the old covenant, nor Paul, the leading preacher under the new covenant, were eloquent, according to their own testimony. See Exod. iv, 10, "And Moses said unto the Lord, I am not *eloquent*, [literally, *I am not a man of words*, לֹא אִישׁ דְּבָרִים אָנֹכִי—not *a* λόγιος,] neither heretofore nor since Thou hast spoken unto thy servant; *but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue.* And the Lord said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? Have not I, the Lord? Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say. And he said, O my Lord, send, I pray thee, by the hand thou wilt [shouldest] send. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses, and he said, Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well; and also, behold, he cometh forth to meet thee: and when he seeth thee, he will be glad in his heart. And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth, and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do. And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people; and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God."

The above words show the fact that a public teacher must have, first, *adequate knowledge*, and secondly, an ability to communicate. Though he may not be *eloquent*, yet still he is to preach. The anger of the Lord was justifiable, in that Moses was unwilling to use the talents, such as they were, that God

had given him. God therefore commissioned to go with him his *eloquent* brother Aaron. "He shall be thy spokesman unto the people. He shall be to thee for a mouth, but thou shalt be to him instead of God." Aaron was the man of words, the λόγιος; but Moses was as God to him, or the man of knowledge. In the work of preaching, the latter is *essential, necessary*, the former is *important*. The story of the Gospel must first be known, comprehended; it is of the greatest importance that it be offered in an eloquent, agreeable manner.

We would further show the correctness of this view by a reference to the case of Jeremiah. See Jeremiah first chapter, verses 4–10: "Then the word of the Lord came unto me, [Jeremiah,] saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee: before thou camest out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. Then said I, *Ah, Lord God, I cannot speak, for I am a child.* And the Lord said, Say not, I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces; for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord. Then the Lord put forth his hand and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. See, I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant." "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth; whatsoever I shall command thee, thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces." Let the reader observe that the matter of eloquence is not here alluded to, but only the subject, and the bravery with which the truth should be spoken.

That the false apostles took a correct view of the Apostle Paul, is not denied by him. "For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible." See 2 Cor. x, 10. Indeed, its correctness is confirmed by his own declaration: "But though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge." 2 Cor. xi, 6. Again, 1 Cor. ii, 1, "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, [worldly wisdom, σοφία,] declaring unto you the testimony of God."

Again, verse 4, "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

All the above passages go to show that the Apostle Paul was not *eloquent* in the ordinary sense of that word, or in the sense that Aaron and Apollos were eloquent. But nevertheless his speech "was in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

### § 3. Wherein was the Apostle's Power?

It is an important question, *Wherein consisted the Apostle's power?* It was first, doubtless, in a perfect intellectual mastery of his subject; and secondly, in the presence of the *divine afflatus* which filled his soul. These two things are possible of attainment in a high degree by every minister. We do not say that all may attain them to the same degree that they were attained by the apostle, but every minister may approximate him.

In an intellectual mastery of the Scriptures—the original Scriptures—the apostle had the advantage of us. The Greek and Hebrew were vernacular tongues to him. He was born in a Grecian city. He was trained up in Grecian learning. He was familiar with the Grecian philosophy and the Grecian poetry. He quotes their poets and criticises their philosophy. His mastery of the Greek language is evident, also, from the wonderful skill with which he uses it, both in his preaching and in his writings.

He also was by birth a Hebrew. His parents were Hebrews of the tribe of Benjamin, and they had their son carefully trained in all Hebrew learning; first in the ancient Scriptures, and secondly in the traditional or Talmudic learning. He was favored also with the best Hebrew teacher of his time, the noble Gamaliel, at whose feet he was brought up. His mastery of the language is evident, moreover, from his reasonings upon individual Hebrew words, as may be seen in the first chapter of Hebrews and other places, and from entire passages of the Old Testament, as seen in the eighth and tenth chapters of the same epistle. His perfect mastery of his national tongue is further evinced from the fact that he used it with such effect as to stay the violence of the mob who sought his

life when he addressed them from the stairs of the castle of Antonia, as recorded in the twenty-first and twenty-second chapters of the Acts.

But what Paul learned in early life, may also be learned by us. God be thanked that the treasures of Grecian and Hebrew learning are still preserved to us! And any young man, with the excellent helps afforded by modern scholarship, can make himself familiar with them in the course of three or four years. What an attainment is this! an ability to read the divine word in its sacred originals! We are put at once thereby into communication with "holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." We sit at their feet and hear divine words. It is Heaven's voice. The beauty and purity and spiritual glory of the sound is the constant demonstration of its divinity. It is the voice of God, indeed, and not of men.

### § 4. Intellectual Advantages of Scriptural Study.

A constant reading and study of the Holy Scriptures establishes the mind of the reader in their truth and divinity. He feels that there can be no mistake in these holy revelations. As he reads, he is lifted up into the pure heaven of truth. God is at his right hand, so that he is not moved. Here, if I mistake not, is one grand secret of the gospel-preacher's power. He knows the truth he utters, for it has come to him from heaven. It is the voice of God, and its demonstration is perfect. His hearers, who look into his face and hear his words, are mightily impressed. Here, say they, is a teacher come from God. His words are in authority and in power.

If we trace back such a preacher's history, we shall find that one great secret of his power is in the fact that he is *δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς*. The enthronement of conviction or knowledge is so perfect in such a preacher's mind that his hearers are led captive by him. *He* knows whereof he affirms, and therefore *they* believe.

In the nature of the case this is not, and cannot be, so fully true in the person of the mere English reader of the Bible as in the case of him who is a master of the original. It is true that many mere English readers of the Bible, by their long-continued contemplation of certain doctrines, become exceed-

ingly powerful in their ministrations. But in their criticisms of individual texts and words of Scripture they necessarily falter, and are very likely to stumble; whereas, in the case of the scholar, the liability to falter or stumble is vastly less. He calls no man master, and inquires and gets his answer directly from Heaven by the original word, and not through any merely human media. To speak plainly, such a preacher does not depend upon Dr. Clarke's Commentary, nor upon Mr. Scott's Commentary, nor even upon the English version, excellent though it be, but never infallible. He depends, under God, upon himself. He speaks not the testimony of another man, but the solid convictions of his own soul, taught by the infallible word. There is a moral force, a spiritual power, going forth from such a man that infallibly arrests the attention of his hearers. A profound respect is at once begotten for him. There is a charm of originality in his thoughts and words. He is no driveler or retailer of other men's ideas; no thief, no plagiarist. He comes to his people bringing out of his treasures honestly-gotten things new and old. He comes before them with the living, sacred fire in his bosom. He comes with his lips touched by the burning coal from off the divine altar, and he speaks as a messenger from heaven, and the people look upon him with a mingled feeling of wonder, love and fear; just as Israel looked upon the face of Moses shining with the reflected light of the divine glory. Such a minister walks in the house of God as a stream of light, and among the wicked as a stream of fire. The saints rejoice in him, and even the wicked respect and fear him.

Such a minister, also, is not carried away by every wind of doctrine. He has read for himself. His opinions are formed, and new views or interpretations are not hastily accepted; and whatever may be the storm without, there is with him peace within. He stands as a conservator of the ancient truth as recorded and revealed in the Holy Scriptures. All forms of unscriptural doctrine, as Universalism, Socinianism, Millerism, Swedenborgianism, Spiritualism, or Humanitarianism, he weighs in the scales of the divine word, and finds them wanting; and is always ready to give a reason for the faith that is in him, to confirm his views and to illustrate the same

ened, but the emotions and Christian graces are purified, elevated and intensified beyond any previous thought or conception.

### § 6. Hints on Scriptural Study.

We would now offer a few practical hints, to our junior brethren especially, on the study of the sacred languages. And the first I have to offer is, that *they seek out a good teacher.* With the presence and aid of a good teacher, the path at first is thorny and difficult enough. Indeed, we think no man ever yet became a good Greek or Hebrew scholar without a teacher. As we write, a letter comes from one of our young ministers in northern New York, begging us to tell him what books to obtain wherewith to study Hebrew. It is an easy matter to give him a list of the books, but in candor we must tell him that the books will do him no good without a competent teacher.

A competent teacher is one who can read the language with facility and solve its difficult grammatical forms with readiness, and who loves the work and is impressed with a sense of its dignity and importance. He is one who *knows how to teach*, seizing upon the most important points, and who has a generalizing mind; who will task the memory of his pupils only with those things most needful to be known, and which may come into practice in their daily readings. The regular forms, both of the noun and verb, should be committed to memory: the anomalous forms should be left to be learned as they occur in practice.

In both these languages it is important that the student learn, in the first place, to pronounce them correctly and with facility. In Greek this is comparatively easy, the characters being mostly like the English and read in the same direction, namely, from left to right. But in Hebrew the reading is decidedly more difficult. The characters are not only more dissimilar to the English or occidental letters, but the language is read from right to left. And then the consonants only are written in line, the vowels being written over or under the consonants to which they belong. Much practice, therefore, is required in order to read Hebrew correctly and with facility.

We would recommend a careful attention during the first lessons to syllabication or spelling, and then to reading or pronouncing aloud. As soon as the student is able to translate, let it be *verbatim*, word by word, pronouncing the Hebrew, then giving the translation into English. This course constantly habituates the student to associate the sound with the sense, and he learns the word, not only by the eye but also by the ear. Thus both the sense of hearing and the sense of sight are rendered mutually available in sacred study. The practice of reading aloud should be steadily persevered in. Usually students do not do this enough, for fear of disturbing those around them. Every student, therefore, should have a room by himself, that he may read aloud, and preach over to himself the divine words of Scripture without the fear of disturbing his fellow-students. We would here stop to beseech our brethren who contemplate the erection of edifices for the accommodation of our students in divinity during the centenary year, now near at hand, to have due regard to this matter. Let every divinity student have his own room or cloister, provided with facilities for warmth and light. With such accommodations he can read aloud, pray aloud, and speak aloud in a moderate tone, and yet not disturb his associates in adjoining apartments.

So, also, the practice of committing much of the Scriptures to memory is not only important, but essential to the highest style of preaching. Thus we find our Lord and his apostles familiar with the Scriptures, quoting fully and with facility extensive passages. This was the constant practice in the ancient schools of the Church, both among Jews and Christians. It is common for Jewish students to be able to repeat entire Psalms of David, and even whole books, in Hebrew. This was the main business in the early schools of the Christian Church, as at Alexandria, at Cæsarea, and at Ephesus. So, also, in the more modern schools, as at Bangor, in Wales, and at Iona, in Scotland.

But let us return. When the student has gone through the "Slough of Despond" and the "Wicket-gate," which he always finds near the entrance of his course, both in Greek and Hebrew, let him, like a true hero, *push on*, and the rest of his journey will be found to be full of sunshine, flowers, and

fruits. The difficulties of these two languages are mostly at the threshold, in the pronunciation and the grammar. These difficulties, however, in the course of a few months of perseverance will give way. Instead of treading in the uncertain slough, he will soon find his feet upon a hard and beautiful road. He will run in it and not be weary; he will walk in it and not be faint.

The study of the Greek and Hebrew grammars is essential. They are the doors into this temple of wonders. Luther well said, "The best grammarian is the best theologian." The grammar, together with the concordance and lexicon, are the two hands of the interpreter; the grammar first, to find out the forms of the words; and then the concordance and lexicon, to aid in determining their meaning.

It has been said by superficial objectors to the study of the original Scriptures, that the Greek and Hebrew student must after all depend upon his lexicon for the meaning of the words. Not so at all. The lexicographer must prove his work by references to passages in which the word in question is used. The student can then judge whether the lexicon is right or wrong by a comparison of the meaning assigned with the context in which it is found. Thus the student may always sit in judgment upon his lexicon. Take the word יְהוָה for example. Let him take his concordance and see if it does not always mean the great God of the Hebrews. He investigates every passage, and finds it even so. Let him take the word אֱלֹהִים and see if it means *angels*, as some lexicons say. Let him examine every passage in the Old Testament with the aid of his concordance. He will find no such usage, no such meaning. Again, let him take the word עֶבֶד, *servant*, and see if it ever means *slave*. His concordance will refer him to every passage in which it is found. Let him look and use his good common sense, and he will see that it never means slave, unless the context determines it to refer to a case of *involuntary servitude*. Again, take the word אֲדוֹנִי and he will find that it refers to *God* only. Still again, take אִישׁ, and he will find this refers to a being human or divine, which must be determined by the context.

In this way the student of the Bible may treat every word

in the Bible. The truth is, the lexicon is only a work of convenience, presenting the meaning of the word to the eye of the student at once, without putting him to the necessity of ascertaining the usage, and thereby evoking its true meaning.

When the student has advanced so as to be able to read, it may be only imperfectly, he should continue this reading exercise, both with and without the aid of the teacher. He should do it thoroughly and constantly. Every word should be fully investigated and understood. The excellent lexicon of Robinson of the New Testament Greek, and that of Gesenius of the Old Testament Hebrew, should be used. Any of the Greek grammars in common use will enable the student to solve all the forms found in the Greek Testament, and Nordheimer, Gesenius, or Green's Hebrew grammar, will answer for the Hebrew.

Constant reading or repetition must now be resorted to. It is a question among teachers which is the better plan: whether a specified number of verses daily, with repetition of the lessons of the preceding day, and a review at the end of the week, or whether the student's constant advance, say a part of a chapter each day, would not be better. We incline to the latter plan. Let the student advance along carefully, as his time will permit, till he has read fifteen or twenty chapters in Genesis. Then let him covenant with himself to read an entire chapter each day, making a clavis of every difficult word, writing it down in a blank book with its meaning. Let him mind to read aloud as he proceeds, and he will soon be surprised at the progress he makes, and at the mastery he attains over the forms of the language. Let him proceed thus through the historical books, then the poetical, then the prophetic, till all are finished.

We would recommend substantially the same course with the Greek. Let the Gospels be read first, in course or in harmony, then the Acts, then the Epistles and the Apocalypse. All the original Scriptures should thus be read before the student leaves the institution to enter fully upon the work of the ministry. The constant interruptions of the pastoral work will be likely greatly to interfere, especially with the study of Greek and Hebrew. The entire Scriptures should

be carefully read, therefore, before the student finishes his course.

Such habits and such an amount of reading will give the student such a command of these languages that he will afterward go on easily. The new views of difficult passages which arise will constantly stimulate him and attract him to his Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament. They will not stand in his book-case gathering dust from week to week, and from month to month. They will be his intellectual meat and drink, and will be constantly under his hand. Instead of going to commentaries, such a biblical student will go directly to his Hebrew Bible or his Greek Testament to solve any difficult passage, or to determine the meaning of his text. Commentaries, in fact, will be pretty much ignored by him. Instead of bowing down to them, he will be their conscious master. The Bible itself will be his interpreter. He will be often surprised and delighted with the fact, plainly discovered, that the Book of God is its own best interpreter. The interdependence of the old covenant and the new will more and more appear. He will not *need* to read any treatise to convince him that the Bible is inspired: his daily reading of the divine word will convince him of this. And inspired he will see it to be in the highest sense, not in its thoughts only, but also in its words; and he will further see that *any man denying the verbal or plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, must be set down as a superficial student therein.*

It does not materially militate with this doctrine of plenary inspiration, that many errors have crept into the sacred text in the course of so many transcriptions and of so many ages. It has been well said that not a single doctrine, nor a single precept of Holy Scripture has been obscured thereby. But why should such a fact disturb the doctrine of inspiration? What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord? Where there is so much pure wheat, why trouble ourselves about a few grains of chaff? Said the pious Bengel, "*What* if now and then a grain of this millstone fall into the meal? an influence so slightly vitiating is of no practical account."

## § 7. Further Advantages of the Study of the Sacred Languages.

The great advantage gained to the preacher by a thorough knowledge of the original Scriptures, already stated and illustrated, is the *moral and intellectual power it gives to him as an advocate and defender of divine truth.* It remains for us to state, by way of support of this general advantage, a few others more specific.

And first, such an attainment enables its possessor to cope with learned objectors as well as pretenders to learning, and especially with learned Jews. Jerome, in his letter to Sophronius, says, "A Jew, when disputing with you, and wishing to elude the arguments which you adduce, will affirm as often as you quote any passage of the Old Testament, '*It is not so in Hebrew.*'" (See Jahn on the "Study of the Oriental Languages," p. 1.) The mouth of the preacher is then sealed; whereas he ought to be able to say, "Sir, let us look at the Hebrew." The objector is then confused, if not convinced; at least you have secured his respect, and if you do not become the means of saving a sinner from the error of his ways, you will at least shut up his mouth.

Another advantage is, that we cannot always trust the English version, nor indeed any other version, for they all have their faults. The translations are not inspired. They all partake of human weakness. Besides, our version is more than three hundred years old. Passages which were dark then, or at the time it was made, are understood now. Neither the Hebrew nor Greek were so well understood then as now. Oriental customs and idioms are at the present time better known. All that relates to Bible lands has undergone renewed investigation within the last forty years, and new light has everywhere been thrown upon the divine word. These facts could be illustrated and proved by a thousand passages. A skillful hand going through our English Bible, simply correcting its errors and clearing its dark passages, would make a most interesting and profitable work. In order to make such corrections and to understand the criticisms on which they are founded, a knowledge of the original becomes necessary. It thus becomes needful that a minister who would measure

up to the fullness of his responsibility, should become conversant with the sacred languages. He is liable every day to meet with men and opinions, which, unanswered, shake the very foundations of revelation, and thus God's word, and religion itself and its ministers, fall into contempt.

Finally, Christian ministers themselves, unless they carefully study their texts in the original, are likely to go astray. For example, we once heard a minister undertake to discourse upon Exodus ii, 2, "Let every man borrow of his neighbor," etc., and "let every woman borrow of her neighbor jewels of silver, and jewels of gold," etc. He soon found himself in difficulty on the word "borrow." And the longer he dwelt upon it the more dark and difficult the passage appeared, and his audience was finally relieved by a frank acknowledgment that he did not understand the text. If he had consulted his Hebrew Bible, he would have seen at once that the root שָׁאַל, rendered borrow, means simply *to ask*. Hence the simple meaning is, that the Hebrews *asked* of the Egyptians, *as a gift*, their jewels of silver, etc. Hence they were under no obligation to return them. Again, a minister many years ago preached and published a sermon on Romans vi, 17: "But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin." The object of the sermon was to show that God was to be thanked for sin! A simple inspection of the structure of the passage in the original would have revealed the true meaning, namely: that though the Roman Christians were formerly servants of sin, God was to be thanked that now they were obedient to the Gospel.

Others of the old divines often fell into such errors, especially when they attempted to quote proof-texts, often quoting passages entirely irrelevant to the point in hand. So it must be with every minister who cannot or will not see with his own eyes, when called upon to sustain from Scripture any Christian doctrine. We reserve the consideration of some objections for another number.

## Art. IV.—NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE.

*Twice-told Tales.* 1837. *The Snow Image and Other Twice-told Tales. Mosses from an Old Manse. The Scarlet Letter*, A Romance. 1850. *The Blithedale Romance. The House of the Seven Gables*, A Romance. *The Marble Faun*, A Romance of Monte Bene Porta. Ticknor & Fields: 1864.

We began our existence, as a distinct people, but little more than two centuries ago, when a few men and women, with decided partiality for their own ways and opinions, landed on the shores of what is now New England. All American history, poetry, and romance, are crowded into the brief period of two hundred years. The Indians were dwellers on the same soil which we now possess, yet their legends are those of a foreign people. The history and literature of England, both before and since the setting westward of the great American current, belong to another nation than ourselves, notwithstanding a reputable newspaper recently laid claim to Shakspeare as an American writer, because he flourished before the separation of the colonies from the mother country.

Two centuries are a brief period for the rise and progress of a national literature. There are some materials for history and poetry, for both the present and the past furnish materials for them. But he who would make romance out of materials gathered within years so recent, must possess creative genius. He has not merely the pleasant task to "hold the mirror up to nature:" for as actual events and natural scenes are not yet sufficiently remote to wear a romantic dress, the author must create the mist which shall magnify objects of ordinary size to dimensions suitable for romance. The novelist, as he depicts the manners of the living age, has material before him which he has but to weave into such a woof of fiction as may best subserve his purposes. The romance, transcending the limits of the real, or even of the possible, must be projected from the vigorous imagination of the author. It depends for success and permanent popularity upon its perfection as a work of art.

At the head of romance-writers in the English tongue, stands Nathaniel Hawthorne. The scenes of nearly all his produc-

tions are laid in America, the most barren field in all the world for romance; and yet the most common-place materials, by the Midas touch of his genius, are transformed to purest gold.

Nathaniel Hawthorne was born in Salem, Massachusetts, in 1804. Here his ancestors, for several successive generations, had lived and flourished. "From father to son, for nearly one hundred years, they followed the sea; a gray-headed ship-master, in each generation, returning from the quarter-deck to the homestead, while a boy of fourteen took the hereditary place before the mast, confronting the salt spray and the gale which had blustered against his sire and grandsire. The boy also, in due time, passed from the forecastle to the cabin; spent a tempestuous manhood, and returned from his world-wanderings to grow old and die, and mingle his dust with the natal earth." Our author himself was so far an exception to this pleasing picture, that his father died of yellow fever at Havana, and his mother, in shaping the destiny of her son, substituted the academy for the forecastle.

The scenery of Salem presented little to kindle the imagination, or gratify the taste. "With its flat, unvaried surface, covered chiefly with wooden houses, few or none of which pretended to architectural beauty—its irregularity, which is neither picturesque nor quaint, but only tame—its long and lazy street, lounging wearisomely through the whole extent of the peninsula, with Gallows Hill at one end, and a view of the alms-house at the other—it would be quite as reasonable to form a sentimental attachment to a disarranged checker-board."

As there was so little attractiveness in Salem scenery, the mind of young Hawthorne was prone to ruminate upon the past. As he walked the streets of his native town, his attention was not so much attracted by the living people whom he met, as by a shadowy procession, marshalled by the sheriff of Essex, who had been dead more than a hundred years. "The witches! there is no mistaking them! The witches! As they approach up Prison Lane, and turn into the main street, let us watch their faces, as if we made a part of the pale crowd that presses so eagerly about them, yet shrinks back with such shuddering dread, leaving an open passage between a dense throng on either side."

We would think it rather an unpleasant state of society,

presenting few attractions to a cheerful and good-natured youth, when "among the multitude there is horror, fear, and distrust; and friend looks askance at friend, and the husband at his wife and his wife at him, and even the mother at her little child, as if in every creature that God has made, they suspected a witch or dreaded an accuser."

The influence which local associations had in calling up gloomy scenes from the past probably threw a sombre hue over what he wrote, and gave prolongation to the strain of horror which mingles with his stories. To the associations which did their part toward educating the future author, we owe some of the grimness and stateliness with which the worthies of New England are made to march before us, under the shadow of broad-brimmed and steeple-crowned Puritan hats. The childhood of Hawthorne was passed under more favorable circumstances than those of the gloomy children that he so graphically describes, "on the grassy margin of the street, or at the domestic thresholds, disporting themselves in such grim fashion as their Puritanic nature would permit, playing at going to church, perchance, or at scourging Quakers, or taking scalps in a sham fight with the Indians, or scaring one another with freaks of imitative witch-craft."

Young Hawthorne became a student of Bowdoin College. In after years, he drew a picture of his lighter hours "at a country college, gathering blue-berries in study-hours under those tall academic pines; or watching the great logs as they tumbled along the current of the Androscoggin; or shooting pigeons and gray squirrels in the woods; or bat-fowling in the summer-twilight; or catching trouts in that shadowy little stream which I suppose is still wandering riverward through the forest."

After his graduation, he lived for several years at Salem, writing wild tales, many of which he burned, and some of which found their way into the magazines. He claims the distinction of having been, during this period of his life, the obscurest man of letters in America, and thus humorously pictures his mode of existence: "I sat down by the wayside of life, like a man under enchantment; and a shrubbery sprung up around me, and the bushes grew to be saplings, and the saplings became trees, until no exit became possible, through the entangling depths of my obscurity."

He determined to break off the spell which was upon him, and, in 1837, collected his contributions to magazines and annuals into a volume, entitled "Twice-Told Tales." "The musty and mouse-nibbled leaves of old periodicals, were transformed by the magic arts of friendly publishers into a new book."

This publication transformed the magazinist into an author. As the public saw that he was really solicitous of winning favor, and was careful to present himself in due form and costume before them, they received him with courtesy, though with no flattering cordiality.

The earlier portion of Hawthorne's literary life was spent in writing tales. No one of them was sufficiently voluminous to make a book "large enough to stand alone on its edges," yet combined, and sent forth together, they made a considerable impression on society. They are generally gems of art, and valuable on this account, rather than from any practical utility. He does not write to point a moral, but rather to adorn a tale. He tells his story because it is natural to him, and with no apparent motive but to please his reader A young man, shutting himself up in his study and mingling not at all with society, is not expected to give accurate views of practical life, and be sufficiently affected with the evils and errors of the day to launch at them the moral of a story.

Many weird and ghost-like forms are caused to walk before the reader. "The Gray Champion" is a mythical individual who personifies the indomitable spirit of New England. He comes forth gray and solemn before the people, as they are assembled to see a new exhibition of tyranny by Sir Edmund Andros, the colonial governor. The aged champion compels him to withdraw his soldiery, and foretells the downfall of his power. Eighty years after he appeared in King-street. One April morning afterward he stood beside the meeting-house at Lexington, and again he walked his rounds all night about the breastworks on Bunker Hill.

"The Minister's Black Vail," is a piece of crape which a clergyman chooses to wear all his life before his eyes, and even on his death-bed he clutches it with his dying hand. He performs all his professional duties with success, and yet persists

in wearing a vail which separates him from sympathy and love, refusing to explain his conduct by a rational motive to the end. "The Snow Image," which gives title to a later volume of the "Twice Told Tales," is a story of a childish miracle, in which a snow image, skillfully fashioned by some sporting children, takes life, and becomes their playmate. The well-meaning but too practical father, compassionately compels the image to come to the fire with his own children, when the figure immediately melts on the hearth.

The nearest approach to everyday affairs to be found among his stories, is the "Rill from the Town Pump." This has had the widest circulation and greatest popularity of all his smaller productions. It is refreshing to hear the self-laudatory eloquence of the Town Pump, as it bubbles up from the cool depths:

> The better you think of me the better men and women you will find yourselves. I shall say nothing of my all-important aid on washing days, though on that account alone I might call myself the household god of a hundred families. Far be it from me to hint, my respectable friends, at the show of dirty faces which you would present without my pains to keep you clean. Nor will I remind you how often, when the midnight bells make you tremble for your combustible town, you have fled to the Town Pump, and found me always at my post, firm amid the confusion, and ready to drain my vital current in your behalf. Neither is it worth while to lay much stress on my claim to a medical diploma, as the physician whose simple rule of practice is preferable to all the nauseous lore which has found men sick or left them so, since the days of Hippocrates.

In 1838, Mr. Bancroft, then collector of the port of Boston, appointed Mr. Hawthorne weigher and gauger in the custom house. "From the society of phantoms, I stepped upon long wharf, and plumply confronted Captain Cuttle and Dirck Hatterick." He was a good officer, and popular with the sailors, but very properly, as politics goes, was displaced by a whig on the inauguration of Harrison in 1841.

On retiring from office he went to live with the Association for Agriculture and Education, at Brook Farm, in West Roxbury, (Mass.) Here he remained but a few months, for he was not long in discovering that the providence which sets men in families, has wise regard for human happiness.

He turned this "most romantic episode in his own life" to

good account as an available foothold between fiction and reality, for the "Blithedale Romance," written ten years after. He disavows the use of any of his associates at Brook Farm as characters in Blithedale, making the place simply subserve his purpose as a "theater a little removed from the highway of ordinary travel, where the creatures of his brain might play their phantasmagorical antics, without exposing them to too close companionship with actual events of real lives." A prominent character in this story is Hollingsworth, "a self-concentrated philanthropist," the moral of whose career is simply this, "that admitting what is called philanthropy, when adopted as a profession, to be often useful, by its energetic impulse to society at large, it is perilous to the individual whose ruling passion, in one exclusive channel, it thus becomes. It ruins, or is fearfully apt to ruin, the heart, the rich juices of which God never meant should be pressed violently out, and distilled into alcoholic liquor by an unnatural process, but should render life sweet, bland, and gently beneficent, and insensibly influence other hearts and other lives to the same blessed end." The tragic actress of the play is Zenobia, "the high-spirited woman, bruising herself against the narrow limitations of her sex." In striking contrast is Priscilla, "the weakly maiden, whose tremulous nerves endow her with sibylline attributes." She is only "a leaf floating on the dark current of events," without influencing them by her own choice or plan. Miles Coverdale is the autobiographical hero of the story; "a minor poet, beginning life with strenuous aspirations which die out with his youthful fervor."

Leaving Brook Farm, Hawthorne went to Boston, where he resided till 1843. He married and removed to Concord, where he took up his abode in an old manse, which adjoins the first battle-field of the revolution. Here Hawthorne wrote "Mosses from an Old Manse." In his introduction he thus pictures his home:

> A priest had built it; a priest had succeeded to it; other priestly men, from time to time, had dwelt in it; and children, born in its chambers, had grown up to assume the priestly character. It was awful to reflect how many sermons must have been written there. The latest inhabitant alone, he by whose translation to paradise the dwelling was left vacant, had penned nearly three thousand discourses, besides the better if not the greater

number that gushed living from his lips. How often, no doubt, had he paced to and fro along the avenue, attuning his meditations to the sighs and gentle murmurs, and deep and solemn peals, of the wind among the lofty tops of the trees. The boughs over my head seemed shadowy with solemn thoughts, as well as with rustling leaves. There was in the rear of the house the most delightful little nook of a study that ever offered its snug seclusion to a scholar. It was here that Emerson wrote "Nature," for he was then an inhabitant of the manse, and used to watch the Assyrian dawn and the Paphian sunset and moonrise from the summit of our eastern hill. When I first saw the room, its walls were blackened with the smoke of unnumbered years, and made still blacker by the grim prints of Puritan ministers that hung around. These worthies looked strangely like bad angels, or at least like men who had wrestled so continually and so sternly with the devil, that somewhat of a sooty fierceness had been imparted to their own visages. They had all vanished now: a cheerful coat of paint and golden-tinted paper hangings lighted up the small apartment, while the shadow of a willow tree that swept against the overhanging eves, attempered the cheery western sunshine.

The rotation of the great wheel of American politics again brought Hawthorne's friends into power, and placed him in office as surveyor of the port of Salem. With the decaying commerce of the place the wharf had grown dilapidated, and exhibited few or no symptoms of commercial life. Here stands the custom house, the scene of his official labors. "Its front is ornamented with a portico of half a dozen wooden pillars, supporting a balcony, beneath which a flight of wide granite steps descends toward the street. Over the entrance hovers an enormous specimen of the American eagle, with outspread wings, a shield before her breast, and, if I recollect aright, a bunch of intermingled thunderbolts and barbed arrows in each claw."

With a sense of their ludicrous appearance as well as kindness for their infirmities he regarded his venerable subordinates, who crept about the wharves, and loitered up and down the custom house steps. "They spent a good deal of time also asleep in their accustomed corners, with their chairs tilted back against the wall; awaking, however, once or twice in a forenoon to bore one another with the several thousandth repetition of old sea-stories and moldy jokes that had grown to be passwords and countersigns among them."

The change was quite abrupt from the quiet contemplations of the retired scholar to the unintellectual duties of the custom

house, yet he considered it favorable to his mental health and soundness:

After my fellowship of toil and impracticable schemes with the dreamy brethren of Brook Farm; after living for three years within the subtile influence of an intellect like Emerson's; after those wild free days on the Assabeth, indulging fantastic speculations, beside our fire of fallen boughs, with Ellery Channing; after talking with Thoreau about pine trees and Indian relics, in his hermitage at Walden; after growing fastidious by sympathy with the classic refinement of Hilliard's culture; after becoming imbued with poetic sentiment at Longfellow's hearthstone; it was time at length that I should exercise other faculties of my nature, and nourish myself with food, for which I had hitherto had little appetite.... It is a good lesson—though it may often be a hard one—for a man who has dreamed of literary fame, and of making himself a rank among the world's dignitaries by such means, to step aside out of the narrow circle in which his claims are recognized, and to find how utterly devoid of significance beyond that circle is all that he achieves and all he aims at.

The dim conception of a romance which he wished to write flitted vaguely before the mind of the official of the custom house, but he found the atmosphere little adapted to the delicate harvest of fancy and sensibility:

My imagination was a tarnished mirror. It would not reflect, or only with miserable dimness, the figures with which I did my best to people it. The characters of the narrative would not be warmed and rendered malleable by any heat that I could kindle at my intellectual forge. They would neither take the glow of passion nor the tenderness of sentiment, but retained all the rigidity of dead corpses, and stared me in the face with a fixed and ghastly grin of contemptuous defiance.

The following picture presents an office-holder in an unhappy light:

While he leans on the mighty arm of the Republic, his own proper strength departs from him. He loses, in an extent proportioned to the weakness or force of his original nature, the capability of self-support. If he possesses an unusual share of native energy, or the enervating magic of place do not operate too long upon him, his forfeited powers may be redeemable. The ejected officer, fortunate in the unkindly shove that sends him forth betimes to struggle amid a struggling world, may return to himself, and become all that he has ever been. But this seldom happens. He usually keeps his ground just long enough for his own ruin, and is then thrust out with sinews all unstrung, to totter along the difficult footpath of life as he best may.

At the inauguration of President Taylor, Mr. Hawthorne was relieved of his official duties. He thus describes the sensations of a decapitated official:

> The moment when a man's head drops off is seldom or never, I am inclined to think, precisely the most agreeable of his life. Nevertheless, like the greater part of our misfortunes, even so serious a contingency brings its remedy and consolation with it, if the sufferer will but make the best, rather than the worst, of the accident which has befallen him. In my particular case, the consolatory topics were close at hand, and indeed had suggested themselves to my meditations a considerable time before it was requisite to use them. In view of my previous weariness of office, and vague thoughts of resignation, my fortune somewhat resembled that of a person who should entertain an idea of committing suicide, and although beyond his hopes, meets with the good-hap to be murdered.

After leaving the custom-house, Mr. Hawthorne devoted himself once more to literary pursuits, and, in 1850, gave to the world "The Scarlet Letter," a romance of early New England life. On the title-page of his latest production he subscribes himself "The Author of the Scarlet Letter;" hence it may be presumed that he regarded this as the work which best entitled him to distinction. The principal characters of the romance are Hester Prynne, a beautiful, proud-spirited, talented, self-abnegating, once-guilty, but life-long repentant woman, who is condemned by the colonial authorities to wear during life the letter "A" embroidered in scarlet upon her breast; her husband, Roger Chillingworth, learned, crafty, and revengeful; Pearl, her beautiful, elf-like, impertinent little daughter; and the Rev. Arthur Dimmesdale, who once erred and concealed his sin, and ever after suffers the inflictions of conscience upon a most sensitive nature. The child Pearl has none of the naturalness which the great novelists have given to the children of their stories. She is most artificial and unchildlike. Her language is stilted on stiff "thee's" and "thou's," as if she were as old as her grandmother. It is a peculiarity of our author that all his characters converse with strictest grammatical and lexicographical propriety.

"The House of the Seven Gables" was published in 1851. The scene is laid "half-way down a by-street of one of our New England towns" in "a rusty wooden house, with seven acutely-peaked gables, facing toward various points of the

compass, and a huge, clustered chimney in the midst." Hepzibah Pyncheon is an ancient maiden lady, well-meaning, but wearing a continual scowl, which repelled every one. Her brother Clifford is the victim of a great injustice which all his life overshadows him. In contrast with him, we have the smiling, smooth-spoken, popular Judge Pyncheon, prosperous in his life and tragical in his death. Among the more pleasing and cheerful characters of the story, we have little Ned Higgins, the insatiable devourer of gingerbread animals; bright-eyed, cheery, industrious little Phœbe Pyncheon; and the good-natured, garrulous old Uncle Venner, claiming the poor-house as his farm, to which he intends some day to retire, but his plans share the fate of many greater expectations, and he never reaches his quiet retreat:

"And it's no bad place, neither, that farm of mine," cried the old man, cheerily, as if there was something positively delightful in the prospect; "no bad place is the old brick farm-house, especially for them that will find a good many old cronies there, as will be my case. I quite long to be among them, sometimes, of the winter evenings; for it is but dull business for a lonesome elderly man, like me, to be nodding by the hour together, with no company but his air-tight stove. Summer or winter, there's a great deal to be said in favor of my farm! And, take it in the autumn, what can be pleasanter, than to spend a whole day on the sunny side of a barn or wood-pile, chatting with somebody as old as one's self; or, perhaps, idling away the time with a natural-born simpleton, who knows how to be idle, because even our busy Yankees never have found out how to put him to any use? Upon my word, I doubt whether I've ever been so comfortable as I mean to be at my farm, which most folks call the work-house."

In this book common-place materials are wrought into a very effective story. The dimness of romance here almost fades into the "light of common day." The moral is a very useful one, "the truth, namely, that the wrong-doing of one generation lives into the succeeding ones, and divesting itself of every temporary advantage becomes a pure and uncontrollable mischief." We are taught "the folly of tumbling down an avalanche of ill-gotten gold or real estate on the heads of an unfortunate posterity, thereby to maim and crush them until the accumulated mass shall be scattered abroad in its original atoms."

In 1852 Mr. Hawthorne removed from Lenox to Concord, which he regarded as his home during the remainder of his life. In the political canvass of 1852, he issued a biography of his friend Franklin Pierce, the Democratic candidate for the presidency. This book was written as an electioneering document, and although superior to most works of the class, it lays no claim to literary excellence. In memory of old friendship, both political and personal, President Pierce appointed his biographer consul to Liverpool, one of the most lucrative positions in his gift.

At the close of his consular career, in 1857, he spent several years traveling with his family in various countries of Europe. He abode sometime in Italy, and became thoroughly acquainted with its scenery and social history, and as a result gave to the world the last and most labored of his productions, "The Marble Faun, or Romance of Monte Bene."

The characters of this fiction are nearly all American artists in Rome. The principal figure in the story is Donatello, a young Italian Count, who is thought to bear a close resemblance to the statue of the Marble Faun—a half-human, half-beastly myth of a fabulous age. Donatello has the frolicsomeness and gaiety of the animal nature, until by the commission of a crime, in the sudden heat of passion, he loses his simplicity and is elevated intellectually and humanly. "He perpetrated a great crime; and his remorse gnawing into his soul, has awakened it; developing a thousand high capabilities, moral and intellectual, which we never could have dreamed of asking for within the narrow compass of the Donatello whom we knew."

The Marble Faun is the greatest of Hawthorne's romances. The scene is laid in a land whose very atmosphere is favorable to romance, whose hills and groves all have a legendary history. The characters are well drawn, and combined with good dramatical effect. The production abounds in reflections, and thoughtful utterances, albeit they may not be always in accordance with the teachings of standard mental and moral philosophies.

In none of his productions, so clearly as in this, does he vindicate his right to be considered a great poet, as witness the following extracts. Of Miriam, one of his characters, he says:

She was plucked up out of a mystery, and had its roots still clinging to her. . . . Yet it was to little purpose that she approached the edge of the voiceless gulf between herself and them. Standing on the utmost verge of that dark chasm, she might stretch out her hand, and never clasp a hand of theirs; she might strive to call out, "Help, friends! help!" but, as with dreamers when they shout, her voice would perish inaudibly in the remoteness that seemed such a little way. This perception of an infinite shivering solitude, amid which we cannot come close enough to human beings to be warmed by them, and where they turn to cold, chilly shapes of mist, is one of the most forlorn results of any accident, misfortune, crime, or peculiarity of character that puts an individual ajar with the world. . . . As these busts in the block of marble, thought Miriam, so does our individual fate exist in the limestone of time. We fancy that we carve it out; but its ultimate shape is prior to all our action. The sculptor is a magician who turns feverish men into cool, quiet marble. What a blessed change for them! . . . Ink, moreover, is apt to have a corrosive quality, and might chance to raise a blister, instead of any mere agreeable titillation, on skins so sensitive as those of artists. . . . All over the surface of what was once Rome, it seems to be the effort of time to bury up the ancient city, as if it were a corpse and he the sexton; so that in eighteen centuries, the soil over its grave has grown very deep, by the slow scattering of dust and the accumulation of more modern decay upon olden ruin. . . . In Italy, religion jostles along side by side with business and sport, after a fashion of its own, and people are accustomed to kneel down and pray, or see others praying, between two fits of merriment or between two sins.

Here is a spectral picture of the Coliseum:

Fancy a mighty assemblage of eighty thousand melancholy and remorseless ghosts looking down from those tiers of broken arches striving to repent of the savage pleasures which they once enjoyed, but still longing to enjoy them over again. . . . My heart consented to what you did. We two slew yonder wretch. The deed knits us together for time and eternity like the coil of a serpent. . . . . It is a terrible thought, that an individual wrong-doing melts into the great mass of human crime, and makes us—who dreamed only of our own little separate sin—makes us guilty of the whole.

Of Hilda, the most beautiful character in the story, it is said,

A torpor, heretofore unknown to her vivacious though quiet temperament, had possessed itself of the poor girl, like a half-dead serpent knotting its cold, inextricable wreath about her limbs. . . . She had trodden lightly over the crumble of old crimes; she had

taken her way amid the grime and corruption which Paganism had left there, and a perverted Christianity had made more noisome; walking saint-like through it all, with white, innocent feet, until, in some dark pitfall that lay right across her path, she had vanished out of sight. . . . This capability of transfiguration, which we often see wrought by inward delight on persons far less capable of it than Hilda, suggests how angels come by their beauty. It grows out of their happiness, and lasts forever, only because that is immortal.

The close of Hawthorne's life was somewhat tragical, resembling scenes which he has effectively introduced into his romances. A few weeks before his death, his state of health seeming to require the relaxation of travel, he started on a short excursion, accompanied by his friend, William D. Ticknor. They had gone no further than Philadelphia, when Ticknor suddenly died. The invalid must take charge of the remains of the strong man who had lately stood as his support. This sudden and terrible event produced a serious shock on the nervous system of the valetudinarian. He returned to Boston, and paid the last offices to his friend, and soon set out on another journey accompanied by Franklin Pierce. It was now his time to fall, and he died at Plymouth, New Hampshire, on the 19th of May, 1864, so suddenly and quietly that no one knew the moment or even the hour of his departure. He was buried at Concord, Massachusetts, on a pleasant hill-side "in a patch of sunlight, flecked by the shade of tall murmuring pines."

Upon Hawthorne as a writer the world has passed its judgment of approval. Slowly but surely he won his way to distinction and enduring fame. His productions were written to please rather than to instruct mankind. It has been a subject of discussion whether literature should be ranked among useful or ornamental arts. Were all authors of the type of Hawthorne, the question would be forever settled that literature is an ornamental art, designed simply to please. He was an artist of high order, and labored to construct his works with such perfection that they would meet the approval of the most scrupulous taste. Sometimes his words seem "gems that flame with many-colored light upon the page, and throw thence a tremulous glimmer into the reader's eyes."

It is much to be regretted that he did not sometimes em-

ploy his pen upon the topics which enlist the minds of the great thinkers of the world. He did not consider it his mission to battle any of the great evils which afflict mankind, or to espouse the cause of the lofty virtues which adorn and dignify human nature. He had a great horror of hobbies, and no patience with philanthropy adopted as a profession; he was consequently too careful to avoid the advocacy of reforms.

He loved his country; he was thoroughly American, and did much to make American literature respectable before the world; and yet succeeding ages will be left to wonder, as they search his writings, why he left not a word behind him to aid his country in ridding herself of the most gigantic of all the evils which threatened her destruction.

He had no taste for politics, and yet it was his fortune to be patronized by politicians whose capital in trade was joint-stock with the slave oligarchy of the South. If he would maintain agreeable relations with them, the least he could do was to say no word which could be construed against "the sum of all villainies." So far as would be indicated by his words on this, or any other practical topic of the time, like a character in one of his own romances, "he might have lived a century ago, or a thousand years, or before the Christian epoch."

---

## Art. V.—DIVINE PASSION.

That the Divine Being possesses an emotional nature, is generally admitted in the theological world; but the application and illustration of the doctrine has often been attended with much difficulty, if not with absolute confusion and contradiction of statement. We form our conceptions of infinite *understanding* from the finite understanding of the human mind, the former differing from the latter in being unlimited and free from error; but we are told the *emotional* nature of man is essentially different from that of the Deity, in that the latter is incapable both of grief and of variations in degrees of happiness. It is difficult to conceive how such a nature could have any

active relation to human conduct and character, since nothing that man can do or be can either enhance or detract from infinite and unvaried happiness. It may be doubted if the term emotion can properly be applied to a nature of that kind. The common sentiment of Christian believers may perhaps be expressed in these words, "God is so happy in himself that nothing which man can do can make him more happy." And yet it is generally acknowledged that in some inexplicable manner God is pleased with the virtues and displeased with the vices of his creatures. These two sentiments, apparently so contradictory, are alike adopted in unquestioning faith, and with strange unanimity. Neither proposition is ever a subject of much discussion in the pulpit, in the study, or in the Christian household. Both are received in silent assent, the one from Scripture and the instinctive teachings of the heart, the other from the dicta of metaphysics and the deductions of logic. If both sentiments cannot be true, which shall we adopt? "If God were capable of grief he would not be a perfect being." That is founded upon the assumption that nothing which is inconsistent with happiness can be an element of perfection. For, it may be argued, infinite happiness must be in itself desirable, and a being of infinite power can possess whatever is desirable, therefore he possesses infinite happiness. The same conclusion may be reached by the argument that nothing exists to limit the happiness of a self-existent, independent being. The logic is short, and to many, perfectly conclusive.

It seems remarkable, in opposition to all this, that the doctrine of the infinite happiness of God is nowhere asserted in the Bible. It is purely a deduction of metaphysical reasoning. The whole subject of divine infinity is somewhat indefinitely revealed. Distinct attributes are revealed as infinite. Absolute infinity is more inferred than revealed. Even infinity may have its qualifications. An infinity in one direction does not imply its existence in all other supposable directions; nor, according to mathematics, are all infinities absolutely equal. We consider it no detraction from Omnipotence to say, it cannot perform a contradiction, nor change an axiomatic truth. As Arminians we say it would be a contradiction for the Deity to bestow a necessitated holiness upon a free moral agent.

Some of the attributes of God are in their very nature limited. There can be no such thing as a holiness that is infinite in all directions, though there can be *perfect* holiness. There are *boundaries* to right. The decalogue is a series of limitations. Justice, for instance, is represented by the even balances. Here there can be no infinity. Temperance is restraint; meekness is calm endurance and freedom from passion. Even love is limited to the proper objects of love, for some things are to be *hated* and not loved; and, in regard to the proper objects, some are loved in a higher degree than others, both by God and man. If, then, divine holiness has its limitations, may not also divine happiness?

We may well pause before pronouncing positive judgments as to the ways and attributes of the Unsearchable. Even to celestial minds his nature must ever remain mysterious; how much more to the infirm capacities of earth? It is asserted that happiness and perfection are inseparable. May it not be possible that, in the divine mind, absolute and unvarying happiness may be associated with *imperfection?* The griefs of *humanity* have beneficent objects other than the disciplining of the sufferers; may not grief in the Deity have its great ends to reach in the beneficent system of the universe? Qualities undesirable to selfishness may be intimately associated with beneficence. The sorrows of Jesus of Nazareth, even if they be considered as belonging to his human nature alone, are an exhibition of how closely sorrow and virtue can be allied; and the effect produced upon all Christian generations by the exhibition of such sorrows, shows the beneficent mission of sorrow. The sorrows of the Redeemer seemed to flow spontaneously from his exalted, virtuous manhood, and therefore may not be supposed to have been borne for no other purpose than that of atonement. If then sorrow be not inconsistent with the highest style of humanity which was ever made manifest, can we positively assert that it is inconsistent with Divinity? We venture to take the ground that it is not.

When we speak of sorrow as associated with the Divine Mind, we do not mean that degree of it which implies the deprivation of happiness and the existence of positive misery in its place. That which mars the happiness of a sentient existence may be said to sadden and grieve, though it may

not utterly deprive of happiness. The effect is the same in kind as though all enjoyment were banished and pain were substituted. A "joy unspeakable and full of glory" may exist in the soul of the believer while yet he is saddened by the contemplation of sin and ruin. The joy far exceeds the sadness, but the latter is not therefore powerless. We imagine that while Jesus "rejoiced in spirit," even then his spirit was chastened with sorrow. A sad event grieves a happy being as much as it grieves one who is already plunged in sadness, though the former may not thereby be brought even to the beginning of actual misery. So God is grieved, though supremely blessed. There is no more mystery in an infinity of emotions than there is in an infinity of perceptions, which is implied in omniscience. Every perception has its corresponding emotion. If consciousness be *one*, and if the conscious powers, according to Butler, be "indiscerpible," it is difficult to conceive of a multitude of perceptions and feelings entering the conscious existence all in the same moment. Some metaphysicians deny that more than one impression enters the mind at once. If this law is essential to mind as mind, we see not how to reconcile it with the doctrine of omniscience. In opposition to this theory, therefore, and in accordance with the apparent teaching of certain mental phenomena, we are led to believe that the human mind is capable of more than one act or feeling at the same time; or, at least, that *omniscience* is capable of an infinite number of such acts and feelings, while still possessing unity of consciousness. The Omnipresent Mind may be considered as a living map on which every divine thought and emotion make their impress; there is room for an infinite diversity of impressions, but all are connected by the one universal consciousness. God's interest in each feature of an individual's life is not lessened by his general interest in the events of a universe. Love, pity, grief, approval, pleasure, flow into or out of the living spirit of the great Father of all in contemplating the least of his moral creatures, just as much as though in all the worlds there existed only that one moral creature. This is the God our faith pictures and our heart adores.

As to the argument above referred to respecting infinite power to possess whatever is desirable, we are able, from an

Arminian standpoint, to furnish the answer that there is a power which may array itself in opposition to the Almighty, and thwart even his desires. That power is *free-will.* Who will assert that sin is desirable to the Divine Being? Free moral power is desirable, but sin is not. The former is directly constituted by infinite power, and is in perfect accordance with the divine will and holiness; the latter is the indirect result of creative power exerted to constitute a free moral nature, springing directly from that free nature, with the permission, but not by the agency of God, and rearing its rebellious front against the all-holy Creator. Free-will obeys or rebels, perpetrates good or evil acts, pleases or displeases God. The Deity is on the side of virtue, free-will may be also. But, on the other hand, it may oppose the benevolent designs of God, and grieve his Holy Spirit.

In presenting the positive side of the argument, we begin with the testimony of Scripture. Here the evidence would seem very decided were it not for the metaphysical difficulties which have turned aside the natural and obvious interpretation of Bible teaching. We need but refer to a few of a class of passages bearing upon the subject of this article. "With such sacrifices God is well pleased." Heb. xiii, 16. "I was grieved with that generation." Heb. iii, 10. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." Eph. iv, 30. "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. x, 31. "The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him." Psa. cxlvii, 2. "God is angry with the wicked." Psa. vii, 2. Such passages are generally supposed to indicate a very different kind of passion from that which agitates the human breast. No one can doubt that it is different in being perfectly holy, but we are not authorized, from such apparently plain statements of truth, to infer any difference that would imply a passion of another essence or nature than human. For if so, then these words, "pleasure," "anger," "grief," etc., would seem to be words without meaning, in what was designed to be a revelation to man. God is revealed as having preferences: "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn and live." We understand, at least, that the turning and living would give greater pleasure than the dying of the wicked, and hence that divine passion is in some way

affected by human conduct. God is represented as saying, "Is Ephraim my dear son? . . . my bowels are troubled for him," (Jer. xxxi, 20;) and, "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim?" Hosea xi, 8. The very language of a father moved with solicitude. A parent with only nominal but not real solicitude, cannot be said to have bowels of compassion, unless they be a kind of *cast-iron* bowels of compassion. Man was made "in the image of God," says the sacred narrative; and if it be said the expression "image of God" refers to a higher style of manhood than that now possessed by humanity, we refer to 1 Cor. xi, 7, where it is asserted that man "*is* the image and glory of God." If, then, God and man are in their essential natures alike, how can it be asserted that, in respect to an *emotional* nature, they are very unlike? Revelation speaks of *love* as the noblest quality of religion. The deepest and purest love is that which involves the spirit of self-sacrifice. Self-sacrifice implies pain. God is love, so loved that he gave his son; "spared not" his son. Was this no self-sacrifice? If it was not an act of self-sacrifice, how can it be considered as showing forth a love worthy of drawing all men to the Father and the Son?

Revelation speaks of an atonement accomplished through suffering. The expression "Lamb of God" seems of itself to imply sacrifice and suffering as the means of expiating sin. But the Lamb of God is no ordinary victim, else he could not take away the sin of the world. We can not believe that a creature atoned for creatures, nor that man redeemed a world of men. If, then, Christ made atonement, we deem it not to have been his *humanity* alone which did the mighty work; rather we believe it was divinity that gave to suffering its dignity and value in redemption. We look upon a divine Christ, and not merely upon a man Jesus, as the sufferer. But, say some, "The divinity of Christ supported, and sympathized with, his humanity." We answer, if divinity, in so doing, performed no sacrifice, endured no suffering, then we cannot see but that humanity alone did the work of atonement. We cannot recognize the essential Christ as enduring the travail and the agony; only the human suffers; the divine strengthens the human for greater endurance, and enables it to redeem the world by suffering. Rather, we conceive of

redemption as implying a self-sacrificing Godhead, a divine love marked with deprivation and pain, calling forth the seraphic utterance, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and glory, and blessing."

Mr. Watson and others find the source of moral obligation in the will of God. Though we by no means agree with these writers in supposing a thing to be right because God wills it, rather than that he wills it because it is right, yet all sound thinkers agree in acknowledging God's glory as an inspiration to virtuous action, if not the supreme end of life. The natural desire of every forgiven and converted soul, is to please God. But what becomes of such motives and inspirations to duty, if the theory be admitted that, in reality, the Deity cannot be affected by the conduct of moral agents, acting as they will? What becomes of the apostolic injunction, "Glorify God in your body and in your spirit," and the apostle's declaration, which we may understand as the watchword of his laborious and devoted life, "we live unto the Lord?" What but foolish knight-errantry, also, was the ever-busy, all-conquering energy of a man like Loyola, with his life-motto, "Ad majorem gloriam Dei?" and the calm, tireless devotion of a life like that of Wesley, who was wont to say,

> "Be they many or few,
> My days are his due,
> And they all are devoted to Him?"

Myriads of enthusiastic spirits have offered themselves to God, and imagined they were glorifying his name, all of whom, it appears to us, were pursuing unreal, deceptive aims, if it be true that the spirit of Deity is never moved by pain or pleasure.

The instinctive yearnings of humanity go out after a Deity in real sympathy with man. We love to think of God as a loving Father, whose tender Spirit bears blessed influences to every form of humanity that ever loved, or hated, or hoped, or sorrowed, or aspired. The world cannot love a cold, passionless existence, far removed from human wants and cares, such as Cicero represented the Epicurean god to be, living in eternal repose, and only saying, "Beatus sum!" Deistic thinkers have conceived of God as almost an exalted abstraction; Pan-

theism worships only an indefinite principle, all-pervading and powerful, but which faith can never apprehend; Calvinistic theology paints for us the Sovereign Ruler of the universe, issuing those decrees of eternal fate which doom individuals and masses to hopeless perdition, or exalts a chosen number to heavenly felicity. All these conceptions of Deity may well accord with the doctrine of divine impassivity. What is it to the Infinite Mind that sin exists, that millions are suffering, that multitudes sweep on to destruction, if there is no tenderness of passion to be moved at the sight? Such theology does not suit an age of broad inquiries, living sympathies, and unbounded aspirations after the divinely beautiful and good.

It has always been considered instructive to look through nature up to God. "The whole earth is full of his glory." His works bear the impress of his character, dimly reflect his image and perfections. Especially may we from *sentient* nature draw many an inference as to the laws of the Unchanging and Eternal Mind.

Nature is not a sea without a ripple, a symphony without a discordant note. Light and shade, cold and heat, weariness and rest, harshness and harmony, alternately prevail. No light is so pleasant as that which breaks in after the shadows have passed away; no rest so welcome as that which follows toil; no symphony so sweet as that in which an occasional dissonance is heard, relieving the flow of sweetness, yet heightening the effect of the strain. Animated nature is sensitive to pain as well as to pleasure. This may be in accordance with the necessary laws of happiness. Pleasure is found in attaining a desired object. When desire is cloyed there is no longer enjoyment, but only satiety and disgust. But desire implies wishing, and wishing implies want, and want implies pain. A touch of pain seems necessary to sweeten the pleasures of attainment. A recent writer presents this argument very forcibly, "Of the happiest mind it may be said, with philosophic accuracy, it is happy because it can feel the uneasiness of strong desire, and knows how to let pain lift the latch to pleasure, and the very pangs of desire resolve into the thrills of ecstasy. These principles would seem applicable to all mind as mind. Difference of grade can hardly infer diversity of principle. Or if an exception were to be sought, it would hardly

be in the ascending but in the descending series. The higher the grade of mind, the more perfect the susceptibilities, the more, not less, these principles must hold good. . . . As minds ascend in the scale of possible enjoyment they ascend equally in that of possible suffering. If you seek for creatures least susceptible of pain, you do not go up among the angels, but down among the oysters." Among men, also, the principle still further develops itself. "The higher the tone and caliber of a mind, and the greater its susceptibility to intense enjoyment, the keener its liability to the reverse. . . . At the last, then, at the highest stage of being, must the entire argument be reversed? . . . Far otherwise! In the infinite capacities of the Divine Being, we find the highest possible scope for contrasts of emotion. And if the divine blessedness be a reality too august, too ecstatic for us to conceive, it is so for this reason, namely: That the mind which feels it, is susceptible to every variation, every possible tone of feeling throughout the mighty diapason of emotion." Thus we follow the gradation, from the lowest forms of animal life, up through glorified spirits and angels, till we reach the Deity himself.

That kind of suffering which is the result of ignorance, or sin, or imperfection of any kind, must be entirely free from the divine nature; but there is a kind of suffering, which, so far from marring the essential majesty of God, is consistent with his highest perceptions. To a God of truth how repulsive must hypocrisy appear! To a being of immaculate holiness, how loathsome is pride, selfishness, fraud, malignity, ingratitude! How painful, to the bosom of Almighty Love, those sufferings which cannot, consistently with the laws of the moral universe, be remedied! For even the sinful and the lost are objects of pity, though their destruction may be "without remedy." When the divine will and the human will act in concert, God is "well pleased;" when they come in conflict, God's displeasure is the inevitable result. For *the human will has divinely-delegated power* to please or to displease God. This is at once the summary statement of the doctrine we advocate, and the key to all its difficulties. It accords with the most obvious interpretation of Scripture teaching, and with the intimations of nature in all its manifested modes of being. It gives reality to sin; to a life of obedience and devotion; to

sacrifices of love and praise; to proffers of heavenly sympathy. There is a real union between humanity and Divinity. Showers of blessing descend from the one, and the incense of loving obedience ascends from the other. Humanity bows at the feet of the Holy One, the tear of penitence upon her cheek for having grieved her God, and goes from his mercy-seat with the joy of forgiveness beaming from her eye. Conscious guilt cries out, "Against *thee* have I sinned!" Pardoning love answers, "I freely all forgive." This is the religion for humanity, ennobling, beautiful, divine; honoring God, and inspiring man with ardent desire for closer union with the Supreme Good.

---

## Art. VI.—OUR ITINERANCY.

The commission of the first preachers of the Gospel was, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." For three years the little band of disciples had been the constant companions of Christ. They heard the words, they saw the deeds, they marked the whole spirit of the great Teacher. Daily, by precept and example, as well as by the inward working of the power of God, they were trained in the principles, the practice, and the experience of the new life.

At last the hour came when the Master was to leave them. He gave them his final words of command and admonition. He laid before them their work. He mapped out the field in which they were to labor. He cheered their hearts with the promise that he would be with them to the end of the world. And then, lifting up his hands, "he blessed them, and it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven." With the glory of that vision before their eyes, the joy of that hour warm in their hearts, they "went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."

Here we have, therefore, the original commission. The Church was organized as a missionary agency. God did not set up the truth in some chosen place, like a statue upon its pedestal, and bid the nations come from far and gaze upon it. The Gospel was not to be a lifeless similitude of beauty and

strength, but rather a living, breathing messenger of grace, going forth in search of the lost, traversing the whole world in its benevolent mission.

The work of the Church remains the same to-day as at the beginning. It is still to go forth, unwearied in labor, disheartened by no difficulties, dismayed by no danger. The field is still the world. Whithersoever man has wandered, thither the voice of mercy must follow; wherever immortal souls are found, there the tidings of peace are to be proclaimed.

No man sent of God into fields "white to the harvest," ever began his work in truer apostolic style than did John Wesley and the bands of earnest co-laborers whom he summoned to his aid, both in England and America. Without wealth, without honor, at the beginning without even an organization for mutual defense and support—often not only uninvited, but in defiance of fierce opposition—they went forth to tell the story of Jesus, trusting in Providence for the bread of the day and the shelter of the night. The fathers of American Methodism, as well as their English co-workers, feared neither hunger nor thirst, nor cold nor heat, nor toil nor danger. They were endowed with holy courage and burning zeal. They were constantly listening for the opening of new doors—constantly trying to push into the regions beyond. The itinerant often left the conference with directions to go into a given part of the country and break up new ground; to lay out a circuit where none of his brethren had ever preceded him. Sometimes he knew not where he should preach his first sermon or see the first friendly face; and he felt as strange as did Columbus on his first voyage of discovery when he left the track of other navigators, and, looking no more to the shores familiar to his eyes, but to his compass and the stars, boldly pushed into unknown seas. Announcing his errand as he journeyed along, the preacher accepted an invitation to hold service anywhere—in schoolhouse, dwelling, or barn—and at the close of his sermon offered to come again in four or six weeks, if the people desired it. Thus the country was explored and the circuit was formed. Where four or five converts were found in any one neighborhood they were organized as a class, and a leader was appointed with directions to meet the little flock once a week, in the absence of

the preacher. As converts multiplied and strength increased, churches were built, and the society gained permanence and position in the community.

Thus by the force of accidental circumstances, as the world would say, but providentially, as we believe, grew up the Methodist itinerancy, with its constant changes and restless energy. That itinerancy has been, and still remains, a power in the world. We do not claim for it that it has no drawbacks, or that it combines, in itself, all the advantages of all other systems of ministerial labor. We do claim for it that in the past it has wrought wonders; and that it is still a good and wise arrangement, possessing elements of efficiency and excellence which the Church cannot afford to lose. So far from being anxious to divert attention from the occasional jars which occur in the working of our enginery, or to cover up points of friction, we prefer to bring them to the light, that every avoidable defect may be remedied, and every invincible evil reduced to its minimum.

Some features of the itinerancy are not advantageous to the congregation.

1. The people are restricted in the choice of their pastors.

We place this admission on record first, not because it has the weight which some fancy, but because it naturally stands at the beginning of this part of the discussion. There is, in in fact, no congregation where even the majority have this matter wholly in their power. In all denominations the large and wealthy societies have an advantage over others. The weakest and poorest may indeed call any minister whom they choose; but whether he will come or not is another question. Nor are we to deem a man who has his preferences a sinner above all that are in Jerusalem. If he is ready to sacrifice usefulness for ease, souls for salary, he lacks the spirit of his Master, and has no divine call to the work. Nevertheless, where the prospect of doing good is, in his honest judgment, equal, no man is under obligation to choose want, discomfort, and social separation for their own sake. Paul never submitted to stripes when he could avoid them without neglect of duty; he never stayed in jail when he could get out. For this reason, even where churches are established on the Independent plan, they may be as much restricted by a want of

means, as others can be by ecclesiastical law, in the selection of their pastors. The more feeble the church, the smaller their chance of getting the very man they want, and the smaller the probability of their keeping him after they have succeeded in getting him "settled" among them. The system of the Methodist Episcopal Church does not forbid the expression of preferences, either among ministers or people; nor does it forbid that these preferences shall have all the weight to which they are entitled. Still, as our system places in the hands of the episcopacy powers which would otherwise belong to ministers and people generally, and as restriction in Church or state is unpopular, we concede that this feature of the itinerancy is, on the surface, an objection to it.

2. The itinerant system, at certain fixed intervals, removes the pastor with whom the people have become acquainted, and substitutes a stranger in his place.

Where the pastor remains many years in the same location, he becomes familiar with the names, the faces, the history of all who attend his ministrations. He is acquainted with the religious state of each of them, and is prepared to warn, encourage, rebuke, exhort, not at random, but understandingly, just as an old physician knows the constitutional peculiarities of his patients, and how to prescribe for them. Long-continued kindness and friendly intercourse, enforced by holy living, give power to his words. Year after year he is with them amid life's changing scenes. He officiates at marriages and funerals; he is the family friend and adviser, who has long shared in their joys and their sorrows, and whose very presence suggests a thousand tender memories, even the saddest of which only strengthen his hold upon their hearts.

But among us, every three years, as the law now stands, the minister is assigned a new field of labor, where he is partially or altogether a stranger. New faces surround him; and months, at least, must elapse before he can establish that friendship and mutual confidence which are so desirable both for his usefulness and the good of his people, or even call them by name. This feature of the itinerancy is certainly not one of the elements of its strength.

3. This continual changing of pastors is liable to make the

labors and plans of the Church a thing of fits and starts and changes.

One pastor considers the condition of the church where he is located, looks around upon the community, and proceeds to lay his plans for doing good. He has his convictions in regard to the Sabbath-school, the teachers' Bible-class, the class-meetings, the circulation of tracts, and he convinces his people of the soundness of his views, and puts them in operation. Interest is created, good is done, and greater good promised. But his three years expire; he goes his way and his successor comes. He, too, has his convictions and his plans. The arrangements made by his predecessor do not suit him; and he lays them aside for other plans and agencies, which are no longer-lived than those which they supplant. Thus the church suffers, because nothing lasts long enough to do its work. The changes in the pastorate are not favorable to the success of measures which require time to develop their results.

4. Another evil incidental to the itinerant system is, that, under it, societies and congregations have less cohesive force than their own good demands.

Our ecclesiastical loyalty regards the whole Church, rather than the particular society to which we are attached. In towns and cities where there are several churches of our own denomination, they fear each other more than any other rivals. When the official brethren are considering whom they would like to have for their next pastor, the thought uppermost in their minds is, the necessity of securing a preacher at least equal in attractive power to their neighbors', that their congregations may not scatter. A Methodist church half a mile away, disturbs them more than half a dozen churches of any other name on the same square. If three or four Methodist churches are within easy reach of each other, the competition is almost too strong for good fellowship. If one of them secures a preacher of uncommon popularity, the others undergo a depleting process. Some members of the church, and many more of the congregation, drift about very much as the tide carries them. If those who are entitled to certificates of membership would take them, and, enlisting under their new leader, be good and faithful co-workers with him, the injury

which they inflict, and the loss which they sustain, would be less. But just in the degree in which they form the habit of wandering about from Sabbath to Sabbath, they are useless in the church to which they belong, and valueless everywhere else. They form no settled religious habits. They are available for no important work. Having no root anywhere they have no more chance for spiritual life and growth than a tree would have of living and growing if it were dug up and set out in a new place every three days.

This, we are persuaded, is one cause of the fearful amount of apostasy among us. If every one of our professed converts could be made to see clearly and feel deeply that he is in duty bound to be an active, steady worker in the society whose register bears his name—that in the house of God, whenever opened for worship—in the Sunday school, the class room and prayer meeting, there is a place which God and the church expect him to fill—that in the path of faithful, habitual obedience lie peace and safety, "glory, honor and immortality," and there alone—there would be fewer cases of religious failure among us. They who would prosper spiritually, must have a spiritual home. The Psalmist compares the ungodly to chaff blown about with every wind, while the true servant of God is as a tree whose leaf never withers, because it is "planted by the rivers of water." There are plants which float upon the surface of our ponds, and have no hold upon the soil. There is also a rootless Chinese plant which draws its sustenance from the air alone; but neither the native production nor the foreign curiosity ever becomes a tree.

Just in proportion to the number of those members who have no root, no feeling of local responsibility, a society lacks solid strength. Where they are numerous, the Church is unsteady and unreliable. Within the space of a few months, or even weeks, it will pass from a comparative solitude to a crowd, from apathy to enthusiasm, from the freezing point to fever heat, and back again. This is the sin which doth so easily beset the Methodist Churches in the cities. The plan of renting the pews, whatever may be its disadvantages in other directions, tends, in a degree, to remedy the evil. The recent lengthening of the term of pastoral service will also, we think, lessen it. But the best remedy for it would be a deep

and general conviction among the members of our churches that their peace and safety, their usefulness, their duty to God, to themselves, to their families, demand that they have a church home,—a deep and general conviction that the "living stones" of God's great temple are hewn, squared, laid in their place, and cemented there, not like the pebbles that lie in the bed of the mountain stream, one day whirling along amid the flood and the foam, and the next buried out of sight in the mud. In regard to the stability of the society and congregation, we admit that systems more local and less denominational in their spirit have some advantage over us.

5. The changes of our system sometimes come inopportunely.

God pours out his Spirit, and many are gathered into the fold. These regard with great respect and affection the minister who led them to Christ. If they fall into doubt and temptation they can tell him of their conflicts more readily than any one else. If they wander from the way, a word from him seems to have more weight than admonition from any other source. He is their counsellor, their guide, their spiritual father. A few months pass on, and they reach a critical period in their religious history. The sudden emotions which attended the first part of their experience have subsided, as they needs must. They are no longer swept onward by a tumultuous tide of new joys and hopes. They begin to find that there are currents that set against them, and that only by hard toiling they can make their way. The discovery discourages them. Their great enemy, once defeated, rallies his forces, and returns to the assault, hurling upon them fiery arrows of unbelief and fear. Suppose just at this point the pastor is removed and a new ones comes. They know him not. They cannot approach him as they were accustomed to approach the other. Weeks, perhaps months, elapse before some of them become acquainted with him: and meanwhile, like a little company of soldiers separated from the main body, they may be attacked and defeated by the watchful and crafty foe.

It may be replied that those who fall away at such times have felt no gracious influence; that they were converted to the man, and not to the truth. We are not so sure of that. God's modes of dealing with us take into the account every affection

of our hearts, and press into the service every element of our nature. That the convert should care nothing for him who has warned and entreated him, and finally through divine grace, led him to the fountain of life, would be unnatural. If love and brotherhood belong at all to the Christian character, surely here is a fitting place for their manifestation. And if the communion of saints is a good thing, cheering, strengthening, this peculiar bond of union must be powerful to hold men to their duty; and, humanly speaking, its rupture under the circumstances named must be to some dangerous, if not disastrous.

6. The brief pastorates of our system are liable to create an unwise love of novelty and excitement.

When a man of only average ability occupies the same pulpit for a long term of years, his ministry will not interest his hearers, nor wield the same power over them that it would were he a new man among them. He becomes a book which the congregation have read and reviewed—a "thrice-told tale." The tendency is to dullness and deadness. The itinerant system, on the contrary, by its periodic changes, rouses curiosity, and draws the people to the house God by the force of novelty. Hence there is danger in an opposite direction, the danger of creating a restless, feverish demand for novelty and excitement. The hearer may unconsciously fall into the habit of estimating the sermon in proportion to its power to please for the moment, and pay more attention to the messenger than to the good tidings which he proclaims. There is a possibility that the mind may be entertained while the heart is not reached; that we watch so closely for eloquence that we forget worship, and in the very temple of the Lord, become more thoughtful than prayerful, and critical rather than devout.

It seems clear that a congregation seeking a new pastor among scores of candidates, and hearing one stranger after another every sabbath, will run down in the spirituality of worship. And under the continual changes of the itinerancy, the same tendency is strong enough in some minds to justify our being on our guard against it. How our people prick up their ears at the sound of a new name! How ready some of them are to run from one church to another, when they hear the announcement of some unusual theme! They may not

examine their own hearts sufficiently to comprehend their motives; still it is not uncharitable for us to suspect that if they would sift the matter, they would find they are in quest of entertainment rather than spiritual profit, and that they are more curious than pious. The plea that they are in search of good sermons, that they wander anxiously about for the health of their souls, is disproved by the fact that they show otherwise no unusual regard for their spiritual interests; and that, as a rule, they are less attentive to the other means of grace, the prayer meeting and the class meeting—less reliable for any good word or work—than those who are always found in their places in the house of God.

Here, then, is one of the incidental evils of the itinerant system. In minds of a certain class it fosters a love of excitement, which wars directly with true devotion, and with that serious, prayerful hearing of the word which leads to growth in grace. To those who listen only to criticise, nothing that they hear seems to have divine weight. They are so absorbed in watching the style in which the preacher does his work, that in their case, at least, nothing is done. Their minds resemble those bad anchorage grounds which annoy the sailor, and endanger the ship, where the vessel drags all her anchors because the mud is too soft for them to take hold. The apostolic warning in regard to "itching ears" is not an unnecessary admonition.

7. Another evil incidental to the itinerancy is, that in regard to their degree of responsibility for the success of the gospel, the views of our people are not always as clear, nor their convictions as deep, as they should be.

Our system gives rise to an incessant measuring and weighing of ministers. The constant inquiry is—"How does he succeed?" The great demand is for men that "make things go." Within certain limits, the inquiry and the demand are right. The pastor of a church has a greater responsibility than any other man connected with it. He has more power for good or evil. His zeal may rouse that of his people, his holy life be their pattern, his faith, hope and charity teach them the same graces. His feebleness may weaken the Church, his coldness chill it, his follies rend it. At the same time the members of the Church have their obligations, numerous and weighty, which

it is not well to forget. The pastor is the leader of the host: but what can a leader do without men? He may be the captain of the ship: but the members are not mere passengers, whose chief concern is to eat, and drink, and criticise their fare, and lounge in the sunshine when they find themselves unable to sleep below. They are the crew. Each has, in the sight of God, a place to fill and a duty to perform. Each man is under a divine obligation to stand at his post, and pull steadily at his rope, by day and by night; when the soft ripples glitter in the sun and make music around the prow, and when the night is dark and storms lash the sounding sea.

In the case of a "settled" minister, the people reason thus: "Here is our pastor. He does not turn out to be all that we thought he was. He is not all that we would have him. But to remove him against his will is a work of difficulty. To persecute him into willingness would be cruel, and divide the Church. Whether eloquent or dull, whether popular or only tolerated, he is our pastor, and we must do our best to succeed with him."

With us, the temptation is to say, in unpromising cases, "Ah, well, this good brother does not seem to be accomplishing much. He will achieve no great success. So we will wait as patiently as we can, a year or two, and then we will have another." And this "waiting" ofttimes signifies slackness, negligence, want of energy and zeal in the cause, want of cordial coöperation with the pastor. There may be instances where this is the best mode of procedure that can be adopted; but such instances must be few and far between. Surely moderate success is better than total failure. To resolve to do nothing until the change can be had is not wise nor right. It is something like a wife's neglecting her family on the plea that her husband is rather a poor specimen of a man, and when he dies she hopes to get a better one.

It sometimes happens, too, that when a pastor is appointed, all are not equally pleased with the arrangement. Some think that they could have made a better choice; and they are tempted, especially if there have been previous debates on the subject, to wait, and let the man whom the other side have selected prove that he is the right one for the place. Of course, in such circumstance slight proof will not suffice, and the dan-

ger is that they will leap to a hasty conclusion, shake their heads ominously, and say with a sigh, "I feared it: I feared it." Worst of all, they fall into an inactivity which disheartens their brethren, and secures the very result which they foretell. And when the failure is only too apparent, they really regret it with the others; and yet deep down in their hearts, their sorrow over it is somewhat alleviated by the fact that their sagacity was equal to the task of predicting it. Thus where the appointment at the beginning does not satisfy all concerned, the anticipation of changes in the pastorate supplies a temptation to make effort less steady, less persevering, less general, than the good of the Church demands. And even in those cases where the labors of the pastor have been generally acceptable and useful, there is danger that the latter part of his term of service may become a mere blank, the people being so intent on making new arrangements, that they forget their present duty.

These are some of what we recognize as points of possible friction in our Church enginery, considered with reference to the people. We are aware that the effects which we have dwelt upon do not always appear; and that even where they are seen and felt there are often compensating influences which work substantial good. We are also aware that in debate these incidental evils are often greatly exaggerated by our opponents. Still, we admit that these are points of peril or of loss, where our system is liable, at times, to put us at disadvantage.

There are, also, under our system, incidental disadvantages which affect the minister.

1. It restricts him in the choice of his field of labor.

Under no system, indeed, is there unrestricted choice. Where the whole arrangement is left to the minister and the people, as in some other denominations of Christians, a man of great attractiveness and power in the pulpit may be sought for so generally that a wide circle is open for his selection; but ministers of average ability do not find it so. The prominent Churches are hard to suit, and make great demands upon candidates for the pastorate. As the less wealthy societies are restricted in their choice by their lack of means, so average men are restricted by the shape which the demand for minis-

terial labor assumes. And, let it be repeated, systems must be judged, not by exceptional cases, but by the way in which they work under ordinary circumstances.

Still, on the plans adopted by some other Churches, there is no legal bar between the minister who wants a church, and the congregation who want a pastor. The society can "call" any man they choose, and the man thus called can come if he wishes to come. He considers the matter for himself, and conducts the negotiation in his own way. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, the bishop who presides at the conference is charged with the responsible duty of choosing the Gospel laborer for each particular field, the preacher and the people both agreeing to abide by his impartial judgment. But sometimes the people are tempted to think, that if the matter had been wholly in their hands they could have selected a better man. Sometimes the minister is tempted to think, that if he had been free to do so he could have secured a better place. The impressions in both cases may not be very well founded. If, indeed, the society or the minister could wield episcopal power in their own case, and not be trammeled by obligations in other directions, the result might be satisfactory to the party making the appointment. But were they to intrust themselves to the independent plan, they might find competitions and rivalries that would reduce them practically to a level no higher than that of which they now complain. But whether real or imaginary, the impression itself may be an evil, and the system which furnishes occasion for it is, so far, imperfect.

2. The itinerancy tends to keep a minister among comparative strangers all his effective life.

The itinerant, as he goes on his divine mission, will find many congenial spirits, and form many warm and permanent attachments. Nevertheless, he has not so good an opportunity as he would have in a more settled mode of life, to form and maintain those deep and confidential intimacies which alone fill the measure of our idea of friendship. By the time he finds out in whom he may wholly confide, he is separated from them by the expiration of his term. Another society claims his mind and heart; another pastor claims the friendly attentions of those whom he has left behind him. Distance

hinders intercourse, and is apt, after a time, to interrupt it wholly. He is like a traveler who meets many toward whom he feels drawn, but from whom he soon separates as their paths diverge. This we account an evil. The itinerancy may have a degree of compensation in that it buries aversions as well as friendships, yet we admit, in this thing, a balance of evil. A man needs tried friends near at hand.

3. The itinerancy deprives the minister and his family of a permanent place of residence.

Permanence is one element of the full idea of home. Most men tend to take root in the soil. The thoughts which haunt the mind of the weary wanderer are the memories, not merely of friends and loved ones, but of a familiar spot, where dwell those whom he loves, and whose every feature of outward seeming—the house, the brook, the hill—is imprinted on his soul. Men have a strong desire to own land, more or less, acres or rods, and possess a habitation which they can call their own, and arrange and adorn according to their taste.

The active itinerant has "no certain dwelling-place." He can remain but three years, even now, in one locality. The house in which he lives is not his own; nor can he do with it as he would. He knows that others are to occupy it after him, and that ideas of convenience and beauty differ among men, and what he builds or arranges with great zeal, others may as zealously pull to pieces. His children have lived in half a score of habitations, and yet, in their after life, there lies in their hearts no tender memory of the home of their childhood; no sunny spot whose every flower and tree, bubbling rivulet and mossy rock, they knew and loved. One child's birth-place is here and another's yonder. If death enters the family circle, he lays his dead among strangers, and the graves of his loved ones are soon left behind by our quick-recurring changes. Thus only in a modified sense does the familiar lyric of "Home, sweet home," appeal to the hearts of the itinerant and his family.

To some, there may be a charm in this wandering life; to many, it may be a thing almost of indifference; but not so to all. Some yearn for a fixed home. They love their work, and hold strongly to our system of changes; yet they cherish an undefined hope that at some future time they will live in

their own houses, and sit under the shadow of their own trees. They husband their means, and buy a farm or a little lot; and fancy that in the coming years, it will be their abiding place. Their imaginations revel in the thought of a real home. They indulge in visions of rest and enjoyment. They build ideal houses, and have day-dreams of planting and reaping, and their heads are as full of romance as ever they were in the dreamy days of their childhood. It may be, that in this matter there is not as much difference between ourselves and the ministers of other denominations as there seems to be. It is very possible that the day-dreams aforesaid may overrate the real value of the thing at which they aim. Nevertheless, the haunting temptation is an evil, as far as it goes, and so we give it a place in our list of drawbacks on our system.

4. The itinerant cannot expect to wield among his people the influence which a wise and good man attains in the course of a long pastorate.

Among us, pastoral changes are so rapid that where the societies are large, the shepherd scarce becomes acquainted with his flock before he is compelled to leave them. His people may soon learn to revere his piety, and respect his judgment; but it takes time for them to know him, and he them, so intimately that a confidential friendship is established between him and each individual. The itinerant makes progress in winning this confidence; he may grow stronger in the love of his people the longer he remains; he sees the blade and the ear, but reaps only a little of the full corn of the ripening harvest.

In the general community he fares worse still. An able preacher, a brilliant platform orator, will indeed soon become known as such, and be in sufficient demand as a speaker at public meetings. But on those occasions which demand confessed weight of character, and influence over the popular mind, the itinerant is apt to be passed by, and the settled pastor put in the prominent place. This is especially the case in the great cities. We are sometimes tempted to fancy that the settled pastors are by no means unwilling to avail themselves of the advantages of their position, and that there is a spice of affectation in the oft-repeated reason which they give for politely inviting the Methodist minister to a back

sent, while they "go up higher"—"Really you are so short a time in one place that we hardly get acquainted." We do not count this effect one of the good features of our system.

5. The itinerancy tends in some cases to lessen the amount paid for the support of the pastor.

Where the negotiation takes place directly between the minister and the people who desire his services, the question of temporalities belongs legitimately to the discussion; and where the minister, by reason of his acceptability, has a choice of offers, and the people learn the fact, there is a spur to liberality. Among us, the minister may or may not be approached by persons connected with the Church which is looking in his direction. They may deem it equally effectual, and more prudent, to lay their case before the bishop and the elders only; and the matter is determined on grounds other than those of demand on the one side and pecuniary obligation on the other. No chance is given to make a bargain. The people know what ministers must take new appointments, what churches must have new pastors, and what arrangement is natural and probable. They do not always feel that there is need of any special exertion in order to secure the man that they want. And even if there is room for doubt, owing to the desire of other Churches to obtain the candidate, the fact that success lasts only three years at the very longest, cools competition. The large city Churches are aware, too, that they are regarded as prominent and honorable positions, and that many ministers feel the promptings of an ambition, not unworthy of their calling, to show that they are "workmen who need not to be ashamed" anywhere.

6. The itinerancy tempts ministers to study the arts of popularity; and, in order to attain position, to use means which "do not tend to the knowledge or love of God."

It is very natural that the itinerant should now and then think of the future, and ask himself the question, "Where will be my field of labor when my term here expires?" He runs his eyes over the list of Churches which must have new pastors at the next conference, and considers which of them are desirable. If his support in the past has not been adequate to his wants, he is tempted to become anxious, and "troubled about many things." If he is naturally desponding, and sensi-

tive, the case is still worse. If he suffers his mind to dwell on the matter, until he lays himself open to the assaults of Satan—if unbelief overcomes faith in God, and jealousy usurps the place of love to the brethren—he begins to ask himself what he shall do to secure the place which he wants. What can he do? Shall he seek to ingratiate himself with the leading laymen? Shall he approach some one of them with whom he is intimate, and ask him to advocate his cause? Shall he speak slightingly of the merits of those who are likely to be his competitors? Our system creates a constant weighing and measuring of the members of the conference; both ministers and people engage in the canvass; and the ministers are often found the severest, the least favorable, in their estimates. Under an influence of which they are not conscious, they sometimes become censorious, and undervalue their brethren. They disseminate among the people of their charge adverse opinions and prejudices, which sour their minds, and increase greatly the difficulties of the appointing power. Thus the friction natural to our system is augmented by the weakness and the sin of those who ought to be wiser and better. Thus they sow thorns for their own feet.

Other temptations are not unknown. A minister who is indolent by nature, and whose piety is not deep enough to furnish driving power sufficient to keep him in motion, may be tempted to take things in an easy way, saying to himself, "I am safe—the Church must find me a place."

On the other hand, an earnest, energetic man, who has never examined thoroughly the moral aspects of the matter, feels the temptation to purchase a sort of success by ways and means which, to say the least, are questionable. He knows that the members of the Methodist Church dote on a crowd. He knows that a man of only moderate abilities, if neither too pious nor too proud, can generally raise the crowd; and that the more light and frivolous the prevailing taste, the more easily the thing is done. Look at the style of the lectures which draw the largest houses. Judged by the criterion of numbers, eloquence, so called, is preferred to instruction, and fun is more popular than fact. The multitudes are apt to run after the humorists whose very faces, in advance of words, provoke a smile. Certain styles of mind, like certain kinds of fish, are

best caught with a fly, and an artificial one at that. Consequently a preacher who thinks that he must fill the house or be pronounced a failure, and is not very scrupulous in regard to the means, being, as we have said, neither too pious nor too proud, is tempted to have recourse to the angler's artificial bait, to cast about him for out-of-the-way subjects, to study small eccentricities in manner or matter, to be superficially original and elaborately peculiar. In this way the crowd may be gathered, but what good is done? The flock "look up and are not fed." The unconverted leave the house of God, not smiting their breasts and saying, "God be merciful," but repeating, with noisy merriment, the witticisms which they have heard, or commenting on the eccentricities which have been exhibited. To them, the sermon is not a warning, a voice from the eternal world, awing their souls into silence and solemn thought, but a mere entertainment, which, leaving untouched the conscience and the heart, amuses for the hour.

The itinerancy leads certain minds into temptation in these directions, because the itinerant must make himself felt at once. He who gives way to an unholy ambition is afraid to trust to sound thought and solid strength, for these make no noisy talk in the community, gather no sudden crowd, create no sudden fame. The really intelligent and thoughtful, who love solidity and strength, are not readily drawn from their accustomed paths; and sudden crowds, consequently, must be made up of the frivolous and the impulsive. Soundness and strength may, in the abstract, be best, but the pulpit trifler deems them too slow to suit his purpose, or to meet the requirements of a system which requires all to be done in so short a time. We are aware that these same temptations may occur under other systems as well as our own, and that full-blown specimens of claptrap and charlatanry may be found in the "settled ministry," as well as elsewhere. Still, we deem the temptation one that occurs more readily under a system which demands rapid results.

Thus we have set forth what we deem the chief points of friction or of danger incidental to our system. We have tried to put them strongly, rather than diminish them. We purpose in a future article to turn to the other side of the question, and inquire for the advantages of the itinerancy. These are neither few nor small.

## Art. VII.—HOW CAN WE TEACH GREEK?

The Greek language has always formed a leading branch of classical education in this country, as in England and many other Protestant countries of Europe, and still occupies much of the time of students during several years. But what are the results? Is there even a single youth or teacher who feels satisfied with his success? Might it not be expected that, among the thousands who have passed through the regular collegiate course, there would be a considerable number who would read Greek books through life with profit and pleasure, and enrich their conversation and writings with quotations from the old masters of learning and eloquence? But where do we find anything of the kind? Would not a private gentleman be regarded as a prodigy, who should be found an habitual reader of Greek classical authors in their original language? And if any person should quote them, even in the most literary society, would he not be called a pedant by others not ashamed of being unable to understand him? At the same time would it be thought strange or improper, if several persons should be heard speaking French or German, although they might have spent but a few months, or even weeks, with one of our able foreign instructors? With such facts before us as are familiar to us all, may it not be well to inquire whether any improvement can be made in our methods of instruction in Greek? We might include the Latin language in the scope of our inquiries, were it not for certain particulars in which it appears in different aspects.

Some writers have endeavored to show that great advantages are derived by every student of Greek, from the discipline which his mind receives, in the long practice in learning and applying the rules of that language, (which is reputed by many to be the most perfect ever known,) and from the light which it casts upon English etymology, even though he may never open a Greek book in after life. We have not seen taken into account the unfavorable influences operating on the mind of a youth, by the prolonged and repulsive task of applying abstract rules and vexatious exceptions to words which he never hears applied to their chief natural

use in speech, and by being at every step reminded of the instructor's incompetency to teach or to practice in that essential department. The contempt for learning, or at least the erroneous or confused ideas of the objects and uses of education which are naturally imbibed in the course of such a training, may exert deleterious influences on the opinions, character, and life.

But, whatever estimates may be made of the advantages or disadvantages above alluded to, will it not be admitted to be desirable that our youth, after leaving college, should be able and disposed to read Greek books, and to prefer some of the classics, or at least the Greek New Testament, to the novels and romances of the present day, and to the frivolous and injurious amusements which engross the attention of some even of our educated countrymen?

And would it not be an additional advantage if this end were secured in much less time? Suppose, further, that the process were such as to educate the mind by a judicious exercise of its powers, to give the student confidence in his own intellectual abilities by their successful use, and to render that branch of learning attractive, the associations of the memory with it agreeable, and the prosecution of it continued through life. Suppose once more, that the student would be acquiring a familiar acquaintance with a language now spoken by an interesting people, inhabiting a country of classical renown, resorted to by travelers of taste. Would these not be additional advantages, worthy of attainment?

But can these benefits be obtained? Is it possible to secure even a portion of them? How can our youth be brought to like the study of Greek, so long and so universally proverbial for its repulsive character? Who was ever known to take real pleasure for months and years in the study of Greek paradigms, particles, syntax, or prosody? Who, from any predilection for this, ever objected to the formal burial of Greek grammars, now annually practiced by graduating classes in our colleges—that severe satire on a branch of study which should be pleasing, and of essential use through life?

But let us inquire whether this branch of education has ever been pursued in a different way, and with different results. That language was almost entirely unknown in Europe during

the dark ages; and its introduction was one of the causes of that illumination of the world by the light of the Gospel which dispelled their gloom and misery. The capture of Constantinople by the Turks drove many Greeks into Europe, among whom were men of learning who brought the New Testament in its original language, so that European scholars might confront it with the corrupted Latin Vulgate. Schools were opened for the Greek language, which was taught on one uniform system, with great popularity and success. It was an easy method, agreeable to the teacher and pupil, the process being that natural to a living tongue. In a short time the pupil could read and write Greek, and understand and speak it with his teacher and with his fellow-students; and no serious objection appears to have been made against the practice introduced by the learned strangers, until Erasmus began to oppose it. He insisted that the modern language was essentially changed from that of classical times, and argued that the pronunciation and accentuation needed great reformation. Reuchlin presented himself as his opponent; and a long controversy ensued, which terminated in the general adoption, throughout Europe, of the system of Erasmus, which has ever since generally prevailed, though with us and in England rather nominally than really. The sounds of some most important Greek letters, in which Erasmus differed from Reuchlin, he described by means of the German alphabet; and to these we generally give their English sounds. Various changes have been made by different authors of elementary books, and by various teachers among us, until no common standard of pronunciation is admitted. A great diversity exists, without any prospect of assimilation, although efforts have been made to establish some kind of uniformity. One conclusion is certain, namely, that if the Erasmian system of pronunciation is correct, ours must necessarily be wrong, because we do not in fact practice this.

But the design of this article is not to discuss the questions between Erasmus and Reuchlin, or those relating to accent and quantity. Neither do we intend to inquire whether the modern Greeks speak a dialect of the ancient or a distinct language. The object is a purely practical one: to propose such a change in the method of instruction that the teachers

and the learners may derive from it some of the advantages above mentioned. But, before proceeding to explain the plan in view, it may be gratifying to some readers to take a hasty glance at the objections most commonly urged against the claims of modern Greek to the character of a dialect of of the ancient, and the answers which have been given to them.

*Objection* 1*st.* The orthography was, for a long time, very irregular.

*Reply.* So was that of English in past centuries: but that of the Greek now conforms to the ancient standard.

*Objection* 2*d.* The moderns express the sound of *e*, (as in the English word *me*,) by nine different vowels and diphthongs; and how could the ancients have understood each other, if speaking or writing in that manner?

*Reply.* 1. The moderns understand each other. 2. We express the same sound in our English language by nine vowels and consonants, namely: as in *Cæsar, me, heat, see, seize, oblique, grief, œconomy*, and *truly*. Beside this, we express the sound of *a*. (as in make,) in eight different ways; that of *i*, (as in *time*,) in six, etc., etc.

*Objection* 3*d.* The moderns sound *omikron* as they do *omega*, though the former should be *short o*, and the latter *long o*.

*Reply.* No. This objection arises from an erroneous opinion current with us, which regards the short sound of *aw* (in *awl*) as the short sound of *o*. The sound which we give to *o* in *hot* is not the short sound of *o* in *note*. The modern Greeks, on the contrary, give the true sound of *o* to both *omikron* and *omega*, only shortening the former and lengthening the latter.

*Objection* 4*th.* The modern Greek has no dual number.

*Reply.* The inhabitants of what was Lacedemonia retain it. But it is not an essential feature of the language.

*Objection* 5*th.* The modern language does not contain all the roots of the ancient.

*Reply.* The ancient language *does* contain all the roots of the modern.

*Objection* 6*th.* The moderns generally use the subjective mood instead of the infinitive.

*Reply.* The ancients sometimes did the same.

*Objection 7th.* The moderns often use auxiliary verbs.

*Reply.* So did the ancients, occasionally.

*Objection 8th.* The aspirates are not used by the modern Greeks.

*Reply.* Clyde says: "The rough breathing was very little used in the Æölic; and the other dialects, by losing the digamma, set the example of delinquency in this direction."

*Objection 9th.* The modern Greek has lost many of the inflections of the ancient verbs, which have eight or ten hundred. These give the ancient language, it has often been said, a delicacy, precision and scope superior to Latin and every other tongue.

*Reply.* 1. Many of the inflections given in our grammars to model Greek verbs have never been used in books. 2. Various American-Indian, African, and Tartar languages, have thousands of inflections to their verbs; and the Basque language of Spain has seventeen thousand two hundred and more inflections.

But there are several important points of identity between the ancient and modern Greek. The alphabets are precisely the same; the moderns lay the stress of the voice, in every word, on the syllable marked by one of the ancient accents; and, to a very great extent, they retain the ancient words, accidence, inflections, methods of compounding words, rules of syntax, forms of sentences, and even idiomatic phrases. Some of the most familiar salutations now in daily use are the very same as those given in the Septuagint: as the address of Joseph to his brethren: "How is the old man, your father? Is he well?" etc.

One of the volumes of the Archeological Society of Athens contains twenty-two quarto pages in small type of modern Greek phrases, in common use, compared with identical and similar ones from ancient classical authors, expressly designed to prove that the present inhabitants are the descendants of the ancient Greeks, and that their language must have been derived from them by direct and uninterrupted tradition.

But there is another view of the subject which is interesting, although, like the preceding facts, not essential to the object of this article: classical Greek was not the language of the mass of the people of Greece. Our grammars, indeed,

teach us that, of the several dialects preserved in books, only the Attic is pure. We have time only to quote the remarks of a few recent writers on these subjects.

Professor Ross, in his "Travels in Greece," Vol. iii, p. 138, says, "The Attic dialect was not, as with Buttman and Matthiæ in our hands we should suppose, the prevailing, much less the sole methodizing vernacular of the ancient Greeks. . . . It was only the refined language of intercourse and composition among the cultivated classes in Athens, and was really possessed by only a few thousands. . . . All Greece, from Sicily to Asia Minor, and from Macedonia to Crete, was essentially Æolic, and spoke this dialect, of which Doric was but a modification. . . . In fact, the language of Athens, which our grammarians adopt as the rule, was, at the time of the Peloponnesian war, but a petty exception to the rule. What right have we to require that it be otherwise now?"

Professor Blackie of Edinburgh, the only teacher of modern Greek in any British institution, a few years ago said that "a language worthy of the Greek name survives;" and he continues to avail himself of it in his ancient Greek course.

James Clyde, M.A., by his advice, spent two years in Greece, studying the living language; and, in his work entitled "Romaic and Modern Greek Compared," etc., 1855, says, "There are traces of the modern Greek peculiarities in writings of different periods, in past centuries, which have been accidentally preserved" in the colloquial language of the common people; of which he gives specimens. He calls (for convenience) the dialect of the uneducated people of modern Greece, "Romaic," and that of the educated classes, "modern Greek;" and this latter, he says, has been brought entirely back to the ancient standards in orthography, and to a great degree in other particulars.

Professor Felton, in one of his last public addresses, said that he had uttered opinions on Greece thirty years before which he retained unaltered at the present time; and he repeated them with a seriousness and emphasis which indicate a conviction of their importance, as well as of their correctness. And it seems highly probable that he was impressed by another conviction, although he did not express it, namely:

that the truths which he had so long believed were not admitted by others, and therefore not acted on.

The two principal points to which he referred are these: 1, that the Greeks of the present day are the descendants of the ancient Greeks; and 2, that they speak the same language as their forefathers. He did not undertake a formal proof in each case, although he mentioned some facts quite forcible and apposite; and it is to be regretted that the subject has not been brought more fully and fairly before the public than it has ever yet been. Much depends on the way in which the two preceding points are regarded; more, perhaps, than may be generally supposed.

If the living Greeks are genuine sons of that people whose history we so much admire, and to whom we are deeply indebted, why are we so little acquainted with that family of our fellow men? why have we so little sought our mutual interests by intimate intercourse? If their language is essentially the same as that of their ancestors, why should we not study, learn and speak Greek, as a living tongue? These are questions which any man of sense and reading may answer for himself, without referring to a professed scholar, because the means of information are now within the reach of all.

Professor Edward Robinson, in his introduction to Buttman's Grammar, page 3, says, "The Attic dialect became, by degrees, the dialect of all educated persons, and the general language of books." And, on page 6, "The ancient pronunciation can no longer be determined with certainty. Among the various ways in which Greek is pronounced in modern times, two are distinguished, called the Reuchlinian and the Erasmian, after their respective advocates in the sixteenth century. We follow the latter *because* it is most conformed to *our own* pronunciation, and that which *we give* to the *Latin*."

We may well pause here a moment, to consider how solid these two reasons are. Is it not fortunate that we have no more reasons of the same real weight? But, seriously, ought men of learning to be content with no better grounds than these for their practice in teaching the pronunciation of a language? Professor Robinson, after giving the sounds of Greek vowels and diphthongs according to Reuchlin, which are those of

modern Greek, remarks, "There are indeed traces that this method, in its chief points, is really founded on an ancient method."

But we now return to the chief subject proposed in this paper, namely: the question, whether the Greek language should be taught in our schools and colleges with the pronunciation and accent of the modern Greeks. As we have said above, we need not insist on any of the views given by writers of the degree of relationship between the ancient and modern. Even if we should admit the claims to identity to be as small as might be demanded, what would be lost by adopting the pronunciation of the moderns? Is there any uniform system in use among us? None. We have rejected the Reuchlinian, but have we adopted the Erasmian? To a great extent we apply English sounds to the German letters employed by Erasmus to express the sounds of the Greek. According to Professor Robinson, our pronunciation of Greek is founded on our pronunciation of English and Latin! Can there then be any reasonable objection against renouncing so unreasonable a system as this?

The adoption of the pronunciation and accents of the modern Greeks would not necessarily require any teacher to retract any preconceived opinion, or to abandon any other favorite practice. All might still enjoy the same freedom as now, in inculcating their views of ancient and modern Greek, with the advantages of confronting one with the other in every lesson. Those who pleased might continue the most thorough drilling in the rules of quantity, scanning, and meters. Indeed, they would find much more time at their disposal for their favorite departments, from the new facilities afforded by the improved method, and be better able to descant on the interesting distinctions between ancient Greek feet and lines, which now afford so fascinating a branch of study to pupils. Our youth might be allowed the privilege of drinking deeper than now of the Pierian spring, and enjoy the harmonious and expressive Anglicized vocabulary of ancient meters, abounding in such mellifluous terms as Phercratean, Antispastic, Glyconian, Dochmiac, etc. They might even dip in, and sound out the depths of the "Polyschematists and the Asynartetes;" and devote weeks or months to the

old method of solving the Epode of the Second Olympiac, Choriambic trimeter, the Brachycatalectic, the Trochaic dimeter, the Antispastic dimeter Brachycatalectic, the Pœonic dimeter, the Asynartete with its Iambic syzygy and two Trochaic syzygies; and all the rest of that interesting, sensible family.

Previously to this exercise, the pupil would, of course, pass through all the imaginable inflections of a Greek verb; and, after committing to memory all the changes given in the grammar, in all the tenses, numbers, persons, and voices, he might have had the heartfelt satisfaction of knowing, that the greater part of them have never been used and never will be, except for the purpose of adding to the enjoyment of those who, like himself, are supposed to have a peculiar relish for such useful acquisitions.

But let us inquire: What would probably have been the result if the Reuchlinian system had prevailed in American schools and colleges? Greek would have been read with the pronunciation and accent used by a nation speaking a language which, all will admit, has some important relations to ancient Greek; and that pronunciation and mode of accentuation have advantages which practice cannot fail to make obvious. That they are practically applicable, and with success, is proved by the fact that they have been in use for at least several centuries. Unlike some other languages, particularly French, (which is the baldest child of Latin,) the sounds are easy to us, distinct and agreeable to the ear.* American students of Greek would probably have practiced conversing in that language even before the Greek revolution brought them in contact with Greeks. Certainly since that event the use of the language would have become

* It is easy to make an experiment with the modern pronunciation and accent, by reading in any Greek book by the following rules: Sound alpha like *a* in *father;* beta, *v* in *vine;* delta, *th* in *this;* epsilon, *e* in *met;* eta, *e* in *me;* theta, *th* in *thin;* iota, *e* in *me;* omikron, *o* in *no*, short; upsilon, when a vowel, *e* in *me;* when a consonant, *v* in *vine;* chi, *hh* in *oh hear!* omega, *o* in *no*, long. The other letters have the sounds given them in all grammars. *Diphthongs*—Alpha-iota, like *a* in *take;* epsilon-iota, *e* in *me;* omikron-iota *e* in *me;* omikron-upsilon, *oo* in *boot;* upsilon-iota, *e* in *me.*

In accentuation, lay the stress of the voice on the vowel or diphthong marked by an accent, whether it be acute, grave, or circumflex. The aspirates are not to be regarded.

common, as a living tongue; and men of education would, before this time, have been familiar with ancient Greek classics and modern Greek books and newspapers. What is much more important, the Scriptures of the New Testament in its original language, and the Old in its earliest version, would have been books of daily reading to thousands in families and Sunday schools, instead of the few clergymen who now monopolize the little Greek reading done in this country. Much of the long time taken from the life of every youth by his dull, laborious, and ill-requited Greek studies, would have been saved for other objects, and that portion of it devoted to the language would have been cheerfully spent in pleasing exercises, intelligible, rational and profitable, encouraging and strengthening to the mind, and preparing it to pursue with vigor its future courses. Instead of renouncing the language with joy on leaving the place of a pupil, he would choose the best books of antiquity for the companions of his leisure hours through life; and the libraries of our educated men would not be disgraced by the productions of the frivolous and immoral fiction-writers, who are daily weakening our national taste and polluting American society.

Can our professors of Greek be much longer content to continue their old, laborious and thankless task, Can parents be willing to subject their sons to a course of study so expensive in time and money, with such results as it has hitherto produced?

The following extract of a letter from our reverend missionary in Athens, in reply to one addressed to him by the writer, will be read with the respect which it deserves; and offers a most appropriate confirmation of the views above given, which were written before the date of this letter:

"SCHOHARIE, *August* 23, 1864.

"DEAR SIR—In answer to your inquiry, I would say that I am fully of the opinion, and have long been, that the ancient Greek should be taught in all our schools and colleges with the pronunciation and accentuation of the moderns, as now taught in Athens; and that the acquisition and use of the modern and living language is of the greatest assistance in learning the ancient, and in making it valuable to every student.

"This opinion I expressed many years ago to Professor Blackie of Edinburgh, to the late Professor Felton of Harvard University, and to many other distinguished scholars in various parts of Europe and America. Yours, truly, JONAS KING."

## Art. VIII.—WARREN'S INTRODUCTION TO SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

*Systematische Theologie einheitlich behandelt.* Von William F. Warren, Doctor und Professor der Theologie. Erste Lieferung: Allgemeine Einleitung. 8vo., pp. 186. Bremen. 1865.

It is an acute remark of D'Aubigné,* that "the cultivation of theological science has never produced a revival of Christian life in the Church." But this would only be a half-truth without the corresponding statement with which he completes it, that all revivals of Christian life in the Church have been followed by "creative epochs" of theological science.

The early Church had no scientific theology. Its first age was one of faith and of action—the age of nascent Christian life. But in the very progress of the action of the Church, the need of science soon appeared, as heresy after heresy arose and demanded clearness of apprehension and of definition on the part of the upholders of the faith. In the apostolic phrase, the Church was compelled to "add to its faith knowledge;" that is to say, to bring out the contents of the faith into the forms of human thought; first, as special statements of doctrine in controversial writings and in the creeds; and afterward, as scientific co-ordination of the doctrines, in systematic theology. What is true of the Church as a whole, is true also of every branch of the Church which has ever manifested, by its vitality and endurance, its right to live. The *original* period of its history, its age of revival and struggle, has been followed by its age of doctrine and science. An inevitable law compels every such organism to study and to develop not only its own mode of being, but also its own modes of apprehending and appropriating the contents of the faith. And this study and development is nothing else but scientific theology. So, in the Reformation period, we find the order of development to be, first, life, that is revival of true religion; then doctrine, in the controversies of the Reformers and in the creeds which soon grew up as the necessary expression of the results of those controversies; and, finally, systems of theology, in Melancthon

* Discourses and Essays, p. 318.

and his successors of the Lutheran branch on the one hand; and in Calvin and his followers of the Reformed branch on the other.

Methodism has followed this general law. As a genuine revival of Christian life, and in fact one of the two great revivals which have marked the history of the Church, (the Lutheran Reformation being the other,) it had its first period of youthful action and vital development in the early labors of the Wesleys and their coadjutors, as evangelists, in the special work to which they felt that God had "raised them up," namely, to "*spread holiness.*" Then followed its period of doctrinal controversy, corresponding to the strife of the early Church with the first heresies, and to the battles of the Reformers of the sixteenth century with Romanist errors on the one hand, and with heretical tendencies on the other. To Methodism appears to have been assigned by Providence the task of developing the great central aim of Christianity, personal holiness; and of purifying theology, for the English-speaking races, from the corruption of Augustinism which Calvin introduced into the Reformed Churches; as Melancthon had purged it for the Lutheran Church, and some of the adherents of the Heidelberg Catechism had purified it for the German Reformed. It was in this field of controversy that Wesley, and after him Fletcher, chiefly labored; and to this day their writings constitute a collection of materials for the study of Christian Anthropology and Soteriology, and especially of the points involved in the so-called Calvinistic controversy, which no student, and certainly no professed theologian, can afford to neglect.

Wesley's theology was the growth of his religious life. Of systematic theology, as such, he seems to have had no conception at the beginning of his career, and in this respect he resembles Luther. Each of these great reformers, although both were great thinkers, nevertheless felt out his theological system rather than thought it out. They illustrated the truth (or rather half-truth) of Schleiermacher's theory that doctrine is developed from the religious consciousness; but they illustrated also the other side of that truth, which Schleiermacher never fully got hold of, namely, that the supernatural facts of Christianity, as recorded in Scripture, are the proper and necessary

complement of the religious consciousness, and that scientific theology is the synthesis by the intellect of these two great elements.

Wesley's early reading lay among the English Arminian divines; but he did not find in them clear answers to the questions of eternal moment which his own experience suggested. How can I be saved from sin? how can I be holy? how can I be assured of salvation? these were the imperative problems for him; and to these questions the cold Churchly and semi-Pelagian Arminians had no answer to give. The Moravians were the means of leading him to Christ; and with his personal experience came his clear intellectual apprehension of the doctrines of sin, of grace, and of the work of the Spirit. No one held more thoroughly than Wesley to the maxim, *Pectus est quod theologum facit;* nay, he even carried it so far as to maintain that a good heart will almost necessarily lead to right opinions.

In view of these facts, superficial writers have disparaged Wesley as a theologian. As well say that Luther was no theologian. Both were men of action; but both were also men of profound insight and of speculative intellect. The central truths of Christianity—those, namely, which relate to the reality and nature of sin, the person and work of Christ, and the office of the Holy Spirit—were powerfully grasped by Wesley's intellect almost simultaneously with his obtaining a sense of personal acceptance through Christ; and he never relaxed his hold of them. In all his multitudinous controversies these central truths were his guide and law; he wrote always in view of them, and therefore always methodically. A master of logic, he brought every subject promptly under the imperative categories in which these great truths were formulated for his own mind; categories, too, that he could express in the very words of Scripture, which he always held to be not only the source but the criterion of doctrine. It would not be difficult to gather from his writings sufficient elements of Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology, to form a symmetrical body of divinity in which there would be few gaps to be supplied.

The controversial labors of Wesley and Fletcher were a necessary preliminary to the origin of any work of systematic theology within the sphere of Methodism. It is no matter of marvel, therefore, but quite in the natural course of historical

development, that while Methodism took its rise in 1739, its first scientific theology appeared from the pen of Richard Watson only in 1824. A singularly superficial view of this fact is given by a writer who seems to be an authority in the Presbyterian Church, as his work * bears the *imprimatur* of the Presbyterian Board of Publication. In attempting to vindicate a *quasi* prediction of his own, that Arminianism cannot be a "permanent redeeming power upon earth," and that Methodism, if it holds fast its Arminian theology, must lose its efficiency as an evangelical Church, he proceeds as follows:

It is now only a few years over a century since Wesley began his career. A religious system matures slowly. The truths asserted may, for a long period, hold in check the serious errors with which they are combined. The errors, if not eliminated, will at last work out the dissolution of the system. It may indeed outlast many generations, but what are even ages to the life of a true, permanent theology? It is to be remembered, also, that the Arminian scheme has yet to be reduced to a systematic and logical form. Where is its whole body of divinity, from under the hand of a master, sharply defining its terms, accurately stating its belief, laying down the conclusions logically involved therein, trying these conclusions no less than their premises by the Word of God, refuting objections, and adjusting all its parts into a consistent and systematic whole?

This paragraph was written, it will be remembered, nearly thirty years after the appearance of Watson's Institutes, of which great work another Calvinistic divine, of larger and finer culture, (Dr. J. W. Alexander,) speaks as follows:† "Making due allowance for the difference of age, Watson, the Methodist, is the only systematizer within my knowledge who approaches the same eminence" [as Turretine.] In another place Dr. Alexander remarks, "I read as much in Wesley and Watson as in Turretine." One would think, from the above paragraph of Dr. Humphrey's, that he had never heard of Watson at all; but he adds in a foot-note:

Without disparaging the ability displayed in the "Theological Institutes" of the eminent Wesleyan divine, Richard Watson, we may suggest that the points at issue between the Arminian theology and our own are not discussed in that work with the thor-

* Humphrey, *Our Theology and its Developments.* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board. 1857.)

† Hall, *Forty Years' Letters of Dr. Alexander*, pp. 181, 187.

oughness, the rigid and penetrating analysis, and the scientific order which are displayed in other parts of the book, and which are demanded at the present time.

Yet, marvelously enough, even after this grudging notice, he goes on to say that the first century of the existence of Methodism has passed by without producing an exposition of theology satisfactory to "the logical consciousness," (whatever that may be,) and adds that

> Another century may demonstrate that such a production is impossible, by showing that the logical and scriptural element is not in the Arminian system; that the law of affinity and crystalization is wanting to its disjointed principles; that this theology, combining many precious truths and many capital errors, resembles a mingled mass of diamonds and fragments of broken glass and broken pottery, which no plastic skill of man or power of fire can mould into a single transparent, unclouded, many-sided, equal-sided crystals, its angles all beaming, and its points all burning with light, a Koh-i-noor indeed!

In what casket the Koh-i-noor of Calvinism is enshrined Dr. Humphrey does not tell us. Moreover, we have never heard before of the "plastic skill" or "power of fire" that could make a Koh-i-noor out of separate diamonds, much less out of a "mingled mass of diamonds and pottery." But this is the way in which some Calvinistic divines are accustomed to speak of all theology except that which accepts the Genevan form of Augustinism!

In keeping with the law of development to which we have referred, American Methodism, whose birth was some forty years later than that of English Methodism, has waited as many years after the publication of Watson's great work for the appearance of its first work of systematic theology. Not that she has produced nothing in the field of theological literature; on the contrary, the practical and controversial demands of this period of her development have been most ably met in the writings of Bangs, Emory, Fisk, Olin and others, now among the dead; and of Elliott, Whedon, Peck, Porter, Foster, and many others of the living. But an original and *complete* work on systematic theology has not yet been brought out in American Methodism.* The work in our rubric, by Dr. Warren, forms the introduction to such a work; but, as yet, it is only a

* We have seen an announcement of Ralston's *New Body of Divinity;* but the work itself has not come under our notice.

noble beginning. We trust that he may live to finish the great task to which he has set himself.

Dr. Warren, as is known to our readers, is Professor of Theology in our Biblical School at Bremen, Germany. His whole course of training has tended admirably to fit him for the great task which he has undertaken. Bred in Methodism, he passed not only through one of our own universities, but also compassed the course of one of the best schools of New England theology. He had there the opportunity of studying the Calvinistic system in its own home, and as taught by its most refined and refining expounders, and freed, moreover, from some of its least defensible forms of doctrine. The larger culture of Berlin and Halle, where Dr. Warren spent several years, gave breadth to his mode of thinking, while at the same time it strengthened, instead of unsettling, his faith in the supernatural origin of Christianity, and in the truth of its evangelical doctrines. How widely his studies have since extended, is attested by his able contributions to the pages of this journal, and also to those of the *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

The last fruit of his ripe studies is before us in this first part of his "Systematic Theology," containing the "General Introduction." The preface modestly states that the writer has chiefly had in view, in the preparation of the work, the wants of his own pupils and of younger ministers; while at the same time he hopes that the book may serve to show, especially to Germans, the true nature and historical importance of Methodist theology. If the whole work be executed with the skill and breadth which mark this Introduction, it will indeed serve as a manual for students, and for a light to German theologians, but it will also take its place as the second in order of the Methodist "Bodies of Divinity," and, it may be, as the first in rank. Watson's great work has served its generation nobly; and it will be long before its discussions, especially of the Socinian and Calvinistic controversies will lose their value. But Dr. Warren's opportunities have been far beyond any which Watson ever enjoyed; and he has used them conscientiously and thoroughly. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that his work should be far more learned than that of his great predecessor. Moreover, since Watson's time, theology has not been an unprogressive science; while philosophy and heresy have both been

in full activity of progress. To state and vindicate the Methodist system of doctrines, with reference to the theological and philosophical relations of the time, is a task that must have fallen to some one; and we are thankful it has fallen to one so well qualified to accomplish it.

This Introduction is divided into three parts. The first treats (pp. 1–7) of the Scope of Systematic Theology, and its place in the organism of the theological sciences; the second sets forth the Contents or Object of Systematic Theology, (pp. 8–27;) the third treats of its Form, (pp. 29–140.)

Under the first head, Dr. Warren adopts the old division of theology into Exegetical, Historical, Systematic and Practical. Schleiermacher and others have sought to make new classifications, chiefly on subjective grounds; but the attempt has not succeeded. Hagenbach (*Theologische Encyclopædie*, § 34,) adopts this fourfold division, and vindicates it, both for scientific and practical reasons. Exegetical Theology includes all branches of science relating to the study of Scripture. Historical Theology includes all which relate to the history of Christian life and doctrine. Systematic Theology is the scientific setting forth of the Christian doctrine concerning (1) God, (2) Man, and the (3) Reciprocal Relations between God and Man. It therefore includes Dogmatics, or the Christian doctrine of the relations of God to man; and Ethics, or the Christian doctrine of the relations of man to God. Practical Theology treats of the working and functions of the Church, for example, Catechetics, Homiletics, the Cure of Souls, Church Polity, etc. According to this classification, Systematic Theology is the *third* chief division of Christian theology, including within its sphere both doctrine and morals. It is *necessarily* the third; for as Scripture is the source of doctrine, its study must come first; as History shows the development of doctrine, its study must follow that of Exegesis; as Systematic Theology is the scientific setting forth of doctrine, in the light of Scripture and History, it must follow both the others. In this view of the relations of the branches of theological science, Dr. Warren agrees with Hagenbach, who remarks, (*Encyclopædie*, p. 105,) that "to begin the study of theology with Dogmatics is to fly without wings."

The second part, as we have said, treats of the Contents or Object of Systematic Theology. This has already been implicitly

defined in the statement that "Systematic Theology treats of God, Man, and the Reciprocal Relations between God and Man." An explicit definition is now given. A reciprocal relation implies on the one hand the conduct of God toward man, and on the other hand the conduct of man toward God: the first is Revelation, the second Religion. Revelation, considered generally, and as to its idea, includes the creation, out of eternal love, of rational beings, and the manifestation of God to them. Religion, on the other hand, is the obligation of the dependent creature to love and honor the manifested Creator.* The reciprocal relation, then, between God and man, according to its idea is that of love. The statement and development of these points, and especially the brief but sharp discrimination between Theism, Pantheism, and Deism, by Dr. Warren, is so luminous and profound that we should be glad to quote at length the pages in which they are dealt with, but our limits forbid.

The next section treats of the Christian Revelation and the Christian Religion, as distinguished from Revelation and Religion in general; the actual in contrast with the ideal. The original relation of mutual love between God and man is lost by sin; man is "at enmity" with God, and God has "revealed his wrath" toward man. Is this dislocation perpetual? No: "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life, (John iii, 16,) and sent his Holy Spirit to "convince the world of sin," and to lead the world to "salvation." A new reciprocal relation between God and man is thus established. God, on the one hand, offers salvation, and calls upon man, on the other hand, to appropriate it, and live and love again. The divine side of this mutual relation is the Christian Revelation, or the revelation of salvation; the human side is the Christian Religion, or the appropriation of salvation by man. These points are treated with admirable clearness, fullness, and precision. Of the first, the Christian Revelation, Dr. Warren remarks that it is twofold, the actual revelation,

* "What is religion, then? It is easy to answer if we consult the oracles of God. According to these it lies in one single point; it is neither more nor less than love; it is love which is the fulfilling of the law, the end of the commandment." Wesley's *Works*, II., p. 228, New York edition.

in the person and work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit; and the verbal revelation, in the Scriptures; which testify to and make known to man, the divine salvation through the person and work of Christ and of the Spirit.

In each of these there are two distinct stages: (1) the extraordinary, or miraculous, and (2) the ordinary. In the actual revelation, the first or miraculous stage lay in the historical manifestation of God in Christ as the author of salvation; the second or ordinary stage lies in the continual *application* of this salvation by the Holy Spirit. In the verbal revelation, the first stage lay in the extraordinary illumination and inspiration of prophets and apostles; the second is found in the ordinary and continual use of the word by man. Nevertheless, both revelations, in both stages, are essentially one; they are only different forms of one and the same free and immediate divine act. If Christianity be true, a third stage is to come, in which God will complete and fulfill both revelations in an *extraordinary* way.

But *is* Christianity true? *Is* redemption revealed, and, if so, do we find that revelation in Christianity? . . . To answer these questions is the task of Christian Apologetics. The proofs adduced in books of Apologetics, or Evidences, are generally divided into External, that is, miracles, prophecy, etc.; and Internal, that is, the excellence of Christian doctrine and morals, etc. It would perhaps be better to arrange the topics according to the different claims of Christianity, namely, (1) that Christianity is a fact of history; (2) that Christianity is a revelation from God; (3) that Christianity is the power of God unto salvation. All the customary "evidences" will range themselves naturally under one or the other of these heads.* As to the *methods* of exhibiting the proofs of the truth of Christianity, two principal ones may be named: the historical and the philosophical. The first seeks to demonstrate the genuineness and credibility of the Scriptures by the ordinary principles and rules of historical criticism. . . . The philosophical method takes its stand *within* Christianity, and seeks to show that all the phenomena of history are better and more *philosophically* explained by Christianity than by any other system. The principle of proof is here the same as that on which the Copernican system rests. The historical method is the one generally adopted by English writers on the Evidences; the philosophical, by the German Apologists.†

*An approximation to this method will be found in Sack, *Apologetik*, Hamburg, 1841. The import of the historical Christ in Apologetics is exhibited by Nast, *Commentary on the New Testament*, Introduction, Chapter IV.

† Gass, *Gerchichte der Prot. Dogmatik*, III., 296, *seq.* Wesley, with his usual sagacity, detected the weak point of the English apologetical methods. "I have sometimes been almost inclined to believe, that the wisdom of God has, in most later ages, permitted the external evidence of Christianity to be more or less clogged and incumbered for this very end, that men (of reflection especially)

Part third treats of the *Form* of Systematic Theology. Here it is necessary to fix clearly and definitively the stand-point from which the work proceeds; first, in relation to the various theories of human knowledge, (the Philosophical stand-point;) secondly, in relation to the sources of theological knowledge, (the Heuristic stand-point;) thirdly, in relation to other modes of treating the subject, (the Methodological stand-point;) fourthly, in relation to the chief schools of Christian doctrine, (the Confessional stand-point.) That is to say, the author professes to state his view of, first, the philosophy of Systematic Theology; secondly, its sources; thirdly, its method; and fourthly, its principles.

As to philosophy, Dr. Warren sets aside, in turn, the ideal, the sensual, the skeptical, and the mystical. His own philosophical stand-point he names the Christian-Realistic; realistic because it attributes reality to the thinking subject, as well as to the objective world of nature and spirit; Christian, because, without deifying reason on the one hand or degrading it on the other, he regards it as limited, needing divine illumination, but also as trustworthy in the exercise of its normal functions, and, when submitting to Christ, brought under a divine system of instruction, whose work it is, to bring every man to a saving *knowledge* of the truth.

The third part of this branch of the Introduction treats of *method* in theology, and especially of the method pursued by the author. After distinguishing the various general methods of treating theology as a whole, namely, the topical, (illustrated in Melancthon's *Love*, Ralston's *Divinity*, and similar works;)

ght not altogether rest there, but be constrained to look into themselves also, and attend to the light shining in their hearts. Nay, it seems (if it may be allowed for us to pry so far into the reasons of the divine dispensations) that, particularly in this age, God suffers all kinds of objections to be raised against the traditional evidence of Christianity, that men of understanding, though unwilling to give it up, yet, at the same time they defend this evidence, may not rest the whole strength of their cause thereon, but seek a deeper and firmer support for it. Without this, I cannot but doubt whether they can long maintain their cause; whether, if they do not obey the loud call of God, and lay far more stress than they have hitherto done on this internal evidence of Christianity they will not, one after another, give up the external, and (in heart at least) go over to those whom they are now contending with; so that in a century or two the people of England will be fairly divided into real Deists and real Christians."—*Works*, V., pp. 759, *seq.*

the analytical, the synthetical, the federal, etc.; and also the special methods of treating the several topics of theology, (for example, the biblical, the historical, the critical, etc.;) he adopts the synthetical method for the general treatment, which is that generally employed, from the period of the scholastic theology to the present time. Dr. Chalmers, (*Institutes of Theology*, p. 10, *seq.*,) argues strongly in favor of the analytical method, which he himself pursues, on the ground that, in dealing with a science like theology, in which "we vainly try to find a ligament or connecting principle between one ascertained truth and another, it is better to proceed *modo indagandi* than *modo demonstrandi*," that is to say, it is better to proceed as inquirers than as teachers. The ample reply to this is, (and we sum up Dr. Warren's reasons for adopting the synthetical method in this sentence,) that whoever undertakes a *systematic* theology, undertakes to teach a science, not simply to find out whether there is a science or no. In fact, if Chalmers' statement that we "can find no connecting principle between one ascertained truth and another" in theology be true, then theology is no science, and never can be one. The fundamental aim of scientific theology is to make this connection clearly manifest.

Having thus stated his method, our author is prepared to give his outline of Systematic Theology as a whole, in which he distributes the matter as follows:

I. The Christian doctrine of God.
  1. God in himself.
  2. God as creator, upholder, and governor of all things.
  3. God as head of the moral world.

II. The Christian doctrine of man.
  1. Man in the state of innocence.
  2. Man in the state of sin.
  3. Man in the state of grace.

III. The Christian doctrine of the reciprocal relations between God and man.
  1. Original relation between God and man and its destruction by sin.
  2. Objective restoration of this relation through Christ.
  3. Subjective restoration through the Holy Spirit.
  4. Complete renewal of this relation at the end of the present world-period.

This division flows naturally and necessarily from the principles previously laid down; and its clearness, coherence, and

comprehensiveness, must be obvious to the scientific reader at the first glance.

The general plan being thus settled, it remains to define the principles on which the special topics are treated. These are: (1) *Biblical*, inasmuch as Scripture is the source and norm of all Christian doctrine; (2) *Philosophical*, so far forth as subordinate sources of information and proof, such as the revelation of God in nature and history, the moral consciousness of man, and the development of life and doctrine in the Church, are made use of; and (3) *Methodist*, as the standpoint of the author is that of Methodism. Dr. Warren thus plainly shows his colors, not merely in obedience to the law of personal truthfulness, but also in deference to the claims of science.

> Our stand-point is, as we have said, that of Methodism. In Methodism we recognize the highest stage, both of life and doctrine, which Christianity has yet reached; and, in principle, the highest which it can reach in the way of purely historical development. Believing this, we could not possibly take any other point of view for the exposition of our science.

But an assertion like this certainly requires justification. Our author sees this clearly, and proceeds to vindicate his position by comparing Methodism with the other great systems which have been developed in the history of Christianity. And this forms the subject of the fourth and last point under this head of the Introduction, namely, the *Confessional Stand-point*. It is in this part of the work that the striking originality of Dr. Warren's scientific method appears; nor does it less fully illustrate his acuteness of thought, his mastery of philosophical systems, and the extent and accuracy of his theological erudition. It will doubtless stir up a vigorous controversy; but we apprehend that it will be found easier to attack our author's well-constructed fortress than to destroy it.

> There are four great and thoroughly worked-out systems: the contrarieties of which are so fundamental and exhaustive that every writer on Systematic Theology who is not willing to give up the essence of Christianity itself must, in respect to them, choose and maintain a definite stand-point. They are, the Roman Catholic, the Calvinistic, the Lutheran, and the Wesleyan. These systems rest on different conceptions of the relation between God and man with regard to the work of salvation through Christ;

and correspond to different stages in the development of the religious consciousness. Besides these four great systems there is no other thoroughly wrought out and distinct system. The Greek Church has as yet formed no definitely regular system of doctrine, and, so long as she retains her present views, can form none which can radically differ from Romanism. Still less can the Church of England be said to have a complete system of her own. Her theology is a medley of the most discordant elements. Her books of doctrine are appealed to by Calvinists and Arminians, Puritans and Puseyites, Evangelicals and Sacramentarians, High and Low Churchmen, and with about equal propriety. She may, indeed, be said to be less one-sided than the Reformed and Lutheran Churches; but yet, her teaching embraces almost all the errors and manifests the deficiencies of them both. As to the minor systems, the Arminianism of Holland degenerated into Rationalism; Socinianism cannot be called a *Christian* system of theology at all; and Quakerism has passed into Mysticism on the one hand, and into Rationalism on the other.—Pp. 86, 87.

This general statement is followed by a discriminating statement and comparison of the essential characteristics or principles of these four great systems. According to Dr. Warren, the *material* principle (*principium essendi*) of any system of Christian theology is to be found in its fundamental view of the mutual relations between God and man; the *formal* principle (*principium cognoscendi*) is to be found in the stage or character of the religious consciousness of those who construct the system. Our author admits his obligation to Schreckenburger for the clear statement of this point in his *Darstellung des Lutherischen und Reformirten Lehrbegriffs*, (1855,) in which, for the first time, the formal distinction between these two systems of theology was traced to the different relations of the religious consciousness of the two church parties to the idea of salvation by grace. Its application, in the present instance, will be more clearly apprehended as we proceed along with our author. According to his view, there have been four stages in the development of the religious consciousness among men: first, that of heathen piety; second, that of the Old Testament faith; third, that of peace through justification; and fourth, that of perfect love. To these he holds that the four great theological systems correspond.*

* This statement is, of course, not to be taken as absolute. "There are," says our author in a note, "Evangelical Romanists, New Testament Calvinists, Unjustified Lutherans, and Unsanctified Methodists. The abstract systems of doc

*Romanism.* According to the Roman Catholic view, salvation is imparted through the (Papal) Church alone, and is conditioned on a meritorious co-working of the subject with grace. As to the first point, the Romish maxim is, *extra ecclesiam*, (that is, *Romanam et Apostolicam,*) *nulla salus.* As to the second point, the Council of Trent declares, (*Sess.* vi, *can.* ix,) that "if any one shall say that by faith alone the sinner is justified, so as to mean that nothing else is required to co-operate in order unto the obtaining the grace of justification, and that it is not in any respect necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will; let him be anathema." With this fundamental view all the other peculiarities of the system, as, for example, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, priestly power, the merit of works, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, picture-worship, indulgences, angel and saint reverencing, etc., are closely connected. As to its formal principle, the Roman Catholic conception of Christianity grew up under heathen influences, and manifests throughout the heathen stage of religious consciousness.

Some writers maintain that the Romanist stand-point is rather Jewish than Pagan. There are plausible grounds for this view; but Dr. Warren refutes it in a discussion into which our limits will not allow us to follow him.

The *Calvinistic system* is characterized as follows:

According to the Calvinistic view of the soteriological relation between God and man, the salvation or non-salvation of each human being depends absolutely on the free action of God toward him. God, according to this system, has elected to assured salvation a certain unalterable number of mankind, accurately fixed before the foundation of the world; and has either predestinated all others to certain damnation, or within himself resolved to permit them, unredeemed, to perish in their inborn depravity. This eternal twofold decree he executes unfailingly in time through his gracious sovereignty. With this fundamental view of Calvinism all its other peculiarities—for example, its limited (partial) atonement, its total denial of human freedom, its dogma of the irresistibility of grace and of the impossibility of apostasy—are intimately connected. According to its inmost spirit and essence, this system is a conception of Christianity from the stand-point of an Old Testament faith.

The material principle of Calvinism is thus defined to be the *absolute* dependence of the salvation or damnation of man

---

these are much wider apart than the living adherents to them. In all the Churches, and under all the confessions of faith, there are believing souls raised up from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by the grace of God, and these are one in Christ."

upon the decree of God. Even the new Calvinism, or New England theology, holds fast this material principle. So Professor Park, of Andover, declares that "it is by the conspicuous position of Jehovah's electing love, and not by the article of justification by faith, that the Calvinistic is distinguished from the Lutheran, and from every other evangelical system."*

As for the formal principle of Calvinism, Dr. Warren finds it in an "Old Testament stage of the religious consciousness." Imbued thoroughly with the Hebrew conception of the divine nature, Calvinism makes the same sharp separation between God and the creature as that which characterizes the old dispensation. Its favorite texts are those which describe God as the Almighty. This Old Testament view is, indeed, not only a perfectly true, but also a divinely revealed view of one side of the nature of God; but it is prominent in Calvinism, to a degree not to be found in the New Testament, nor in any theological system except Calvinism. As with the idea of God, so also with that of salvation. The Old Testament makes a particular people the chosen objects of the divine favor, gives the history of God's covenant with that chosen people, and yet makes their blessedness always an object of hope rather than of present possession; and in all these points the analogy with Calvinism holds good. Our author further illustrates this point by the historical love of the Calvinistic Churches and peoples for the Old Testament writings. It has been a characteristic of strongly Calvinistic Churches, to sing the Psalms of David in preference to modern Christian hymns. In no other communities are children so commonly named after the prophets and heroes of the Old Testament. The Covenanters and the Puritans may be shortly described as Old Testament Christians.

Dr. Warren does full justice to the great services of the Calvinistic Churches to Christianity. He honors their faith, while he designates it as of that "heroic sort" which is so highly exalted in the eleventh chapter of the Hebrews—a faith illustrated in such splendid Christian individualities as those of Zuingle, Calvin, and Knox, who, also, like the mighty names of the old dispensation, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, waxed valiant in fight, and out

* Park, *Memoir of Emmons*, p. 423.

of weakness were made strong. Their attacks on Romish error and superstition, in the time of the Reformation, were far more vigorous and effective than those of the Lutherans; and in attachment to Scripture, as apart from tradition, they have always gone beyond the Lutheran Churches. At the same time he makes the remark, which we think historically true, that since the great Methodist revival of the eighteenth century the Calvinistic Churches, both of Europe and America, have laid aside to a large extent the formal principle of Calvinism.

The third of the great theological systems is *Lutheranism*, which our author characterizes as follows:

> According to the Lutheran view of the relation between God and man, in the work of salvation by Christ, the salvation or non-salvation of each human being is solely dependent on his own personal action in regard to the means of grace, (the word and the sacraments.) Whoever uses these properly, (and every body is capable of doing this through his own natural powers,) will obtain from God, through these means of grace, faith, and with faith justification. If he perseveres diligently in the proper use of the word and of the sacraments he will retain the received blessings, and finally overcome death and hell. With this fundamental view of Lutheranism all the other peculiarities of the system, such as the bodily presence of Christ in the eucharist, the relative over-estimation of the sacraments, over-attachment to the Church, etc., are closely allied. In respect to its inmost spirit and essence this creed is a view of Christianity from the standpoint of justification. (P. 119.)

In proceeding to vindicate this general statement of the principles of Lutheranism, our author remarks that the Lutheran doctrines, so called, are not to be sought in the writings of Luther himself, but in the recognized Lutheran Confessions, namely, the Augsburg Confession and Apology, the Catechism, the Articles of Smalcald, and the Formula of Concord. From these sources he gives, in the compass of a few pages, a clear statement of the Lutheran theology proper. The Lutheran anthropology teaches that all men are born *cum peccato*, and that this vice of origin is truly sin, bringing in eternal death. None can be freed from original sin except by baptism and the means of grace.* Before baptism, there is no possibility

* "Our Churches teach, likewise that since the fall of Adam all men who are naturally engendered are born with a depraved nature, that is, without the fear of God or confidence toward him, but with sinful propensities; and that this disease

or capacity in man either of good willing or good working; he is spiritually blind and dead. God alone can and does work salvation; the natural powers of man can do nothing toward it. The question now is, How does Lutheranism, with this view of the nature and will of man in his fallen state, avoid the strict Calvinistic doctrine of predestination? The answer is, That man, after baptism, is *no longer in a state of nature*, but is "regenerated and born anew," and can therefore use the word of God and the Lord's supper to his soul's preservation in grace, and to his final salvation; for "by baptism man is regenerate, and by the eucharist he is nourished in grace," inasmuch as the body and blood of Christ "are truly present, and are distributed to those who partake of the supper."* While none can merit grace by good works, the sacraments are to be received with faith, which is essential, in the reception of the sacraments, to the remission of sins. Those who relapse into sin after baptism may at any time obtain pardon when they repent and believe. In this way the Lutheran theology fixes the final responsibility, as to the happiness or misery of each individual, upon the man himself. Its point of view, with regard to the work of salvation through Christ, is clearly that of justification. In Luther's mind, justification by faith was the *central* idea of Christianity, as in Calvin's, the divine decree was the central idea.

Our author follows this sketch of the Lutheran theology with an appreciative tribute to the great Reformer, to the worth of the Lutheran Church, and to the services rendered by great Lutherans to the cause of Christianity as well as of Christian theology. A copious summary of the Lutheran literature is also given.

The fourth great theological system, in our author's classification, is that of Methodism. It principles are set forth in a brief summary, as was done with the three preceding systems. It is as follows:

According to the Methodist view of the relation between God and man, with regard to the work of salvation by Christ, the sal-

or natural depravity, (*morbus seu vitium originis,*) is really sin, and still condemns and causes eternal death to those who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit." *Augsburg Confession*, Art. II.

* *Augsburg Confession*, Art. X

vation or non-salvation of each human being depends solely on his own free action in respect to the enlightening, renewing, and sanctifying inworkings of the Holy Spirit. If, in respect to these inworkings, he holds himself receptively, he will be saved, both here and hereafter; but if he closes his heart against them, he will continue in death, both here and in eternity. With this fundamental view, all the other peculiarities of Methodism, such as its peculiar dogma of freedom, its emphasis of the working of the Holy Spirit, its doctrines of Christian perfection, etc., are intimately connected. In respect to its inmost spirit and essence it is a viewing of Christianity from the standpoint of Christian perfection or perfect love.

We shall follow our author closely in his development and vindication of this summary statement. In the first place, he does not look for Methodist doctrine to any definite and absolute symbol, such as the Decrees of Trent or the Westminster Confession; for Methodism has no such complete and authoritative symbol. Nevertheless, the whole substance of our doctrine is to be found in our Articles, in the writings of Wesley and Fletcher, and in the universal teachings of the Methodist pulpit, in all countries, of one doctrine as to God, man, and the relations between God and man. "In all Christendom," he remarks, and remarks truly, "no Church comprising so numerous a body of men can be found, in which oneness of faith and doctrine is so general." Of all the four great communions, Methodism, and Methodism alone, teaches constantly, and consistently with her whole system of doctrine, the universality of the grace of God. According to Calvinism, it was not ever the *purpose* of God to save all men. The Lutheran and Romanist doctrine, on the other hand, limits grace to those who are brought within the reach of the *means* of grace, namely, the Word, the Church, and the Sacraments. But Methodism teaches that the grace of God in Christ is universal; first, as to the divine purpose, God wills the salvation of all; Christ died for all; for "he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world:" secondly, as to the work of God for us, (the *objective* operation of grace;) for as by the first Adam, "judgment came upon all men unto condemnation," so by the second Adam, the "free gift came upon all unto justification of life:" thirdly, as to the work done in us (the *subjective* operation of grace;) it "enlighteneth" every man, and

"convinceth" every man, thus putting all men under probation;* for the "grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared." The power of grace to sanctify is fully carried out only in the Methodist theory. The Romanist doctrine is, that indwelling sin can only be fully destroyed by the fires of purgatory; according to Lutheranism and Calvinism, it remains in the believer until death; but Methodism teaches that grace can "sanctify wholly," here upon the earth.

The Methodist anthropology teaches the doctrine of natural depravity in its strongest form;† so strongly, indeed, that Schneickenburger calls it "hyper-orthodox." Maintaining man's total depravity through the fall of Adam, Methodism maintains also man's utter inability, by his natural powers, unaided by divine grace, to take one step toward his recovery. This doctrine is the very opposite of Pelagianism. Calvinism asserts that for original sin men are guilty and punishable; but God has manifested his grace in electing a certain number of the lost race unto salvation. Lutheranism asserts that God has ordained means of grace by the use of which men can be saved in this life from the guilt of sin, and in the life to come from its presence. But Methodism, on the other hand, while maintaining that, apart from grace, the sin of Adam involves the race in his guilt and death, asserts also that, under the economy of grace, none of Adam's descendants are *held guilty* of Adam's sin, until they reject the grace of Christ. That "by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men (all born into the world) unto condemnation," is an undoubted truth; and affects every infant, as well as every adult person. But it is equally true, that by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men (all born into the world) unto justification. Therefore no infant ever was or ever will be sent to hell for the guilt of Adam's sin; seeing it is canceled by the righteousness of Christ, as soon as they are sent into the world." (Wesley's Works, VII, 97.) That is to say, that, through the atoning work of Christ, all men stand in a *gracious* relation to God, (instead of the natural relation,) and are objects of the influ-

* On no other theory is the "probation of every man" possible, or even conceivable, after the ruin of the race in Adam.

† See Wesley *On Original Sin;* Fletcher's *Appeal;* Watson's *Institutes,* Chap. XVIII.

ences of the Holy Spirit. Of course, then, instead of saying, with the Lutheran, that the baptized infant is freed by his baptism from the guilt of original sin, the Methodist doctrine says that the infant, *because* he is born under the "free gift," bestowed in order to justification of life, is entitled to baptism.* If he die in infancy, he is saved by Christ; if he live, the Holy Ghost affords him all the power necessary (a power which he has not by nature) "to work out his own salvation."

With this view of the condition of human nature, the Methodist statement of the relation of the unconverted *adult* to the operations of grace fully agrees. Calvinism teaches that it is simply impossible for a non-elect man, during his whole life, to take *any* step toward the salvation of his soul; nor can the elect lay hold on the grace of God at any period before the precise moment fixed from eternity for his effectual call-

* The Methodist Discipline (Part I, Chap. II, § 2,) treats the relation of baptized children to the Church as follows:

"*Quest.* Are all young children entitled to baptism?

"*Answ.* We hold that all children, by virtue of the unconditional benefits of the atonement, are members of the kingdom of God, and, therefore, graciously entitled to baptism; but as infant baptism contemplates a course of religious instruction and discipline, it is expected of all parents or guardians who present their children for baptism, that they use all diligence in bringing them up in conformity to the word of God; and they should be solemnly admonished of this obligation, and earnestly exhorted to faithfulness therein.

"*Quest.* 2. What is the relation of baptized children to the Church?

"*Answ.* We regard all children who have been baptized as placed in visible covenant relation to God, and under the special care and supervision of the Church."

A question has arisen of late in regard to the moral condition of infants, as to whether they are regenerate or no. Watson, with his usual caution, denies; Drs. Hibbard, Haven, and others, appear to affirm. Dr. Whedon remarks (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1862, p. 268,) that "under the redemption system, the man is born into the world, from Adam, a depraved being. It is as a depraved being that he becomes an *ego*. But, instantly after, he is met by the provisions of the atonement. If he is not thereby immediately, unconditionally, justified and regenerated, his death, before actual sin, would place him out of the category of condemnation. He is held guiltless until the moment of his responsible agency arrives." Dr. Whedon adds, in a note, "that the dying infant is saved by the atonement, we all agree; but his precise condition, as affected by the atonement, as a living infant, seems to be a somewhat undecided matter. . . . Fletcher maintained both infant justification and regeneration. Dr. Fisk held to infant justification." Compare also, Dr. Brooks' article in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, October, 1864, pp. 552, *seq.*, and Watson, *Institutes*, II, 59, 299.

ing.* The Lutheran doctrine, which makes man as incapable of good, by nature, as a "stone, a tree, or a clod,"† makes him also dependent, for the supply of new and supernatural powers, upon the word and the sacraments; if these are not within his reach, he must remain subject to the wrath of God to the end of time. Methodism admits, just as fully as Lutheranism or Calvinism, that man, in the state of nature and apart from grace, is spiritually dead, and of course incapable of any spiritual act; but Methodism asserts, on the other hand, that no man, under the Christian economy of grace, is thus abandoned to himself and the devil.‡ To every man, heathen, Jew, or Christian, is given a sufficient "measure of grace" to profit withal, unto his own salvation, if he is willing to receive it. All the work of salvation is of grace, from the beginning to the end.

Thus the Methodist theology makes the salvation of the believer to be the work of grace, and the damnation of the finally impenitent sinner to be his own work; and the fate of each man is dependent upon his free action *with regard to the grace given;* thus avoiding absolute Particularism on the one hand, and Pelagianism, or even semi-Pelagianism, on the other. And this is the *material* principle of Methodism.

Its *formal* principle, as has been said, is Christian Perfection, or Perfect Love. The ideal Christian of Calvinism is a "servant of God;" the ideal Christian of Luther is a "child

* Some of the new Calvinists avoid this position only by adopting the Pelagian one, namely, that the natural powers, apart from grace, are adequate to the keeping of the law. (Compare Taylor, *Moral Government of God*, II, 131, 299; Hodgson's *New Divinity*, pp. 149. *seq.*

† Lapis, truncus, aut limus; *Formula Concordiæ*, II, 24.

‡ Compare Watson's admirable discussion (Institutes, Vol. II, p. 377, *seq.*): "It follows, then, that the doctrine of the impartation of grace to the unconverted, in a sufficient degree to enable them to embrace the Gospel, must be admitted; and with this doctrine comes in that of a power in man to use or to spurn this heavenly gift and gracious assistance; in other words, a power of willing to come to Christ, even when men do not come; a power of considering their ways, and turning to the Lord, when they do not consider them, and turn to him; a power of praying, when they do not pray; and a power of believing, when they do not believe—powers all of grace: all the results of the work of the Spirit in the heart; but powers to be exerted by man, since it is man, and not God, who wills, and turns, and prays, and believes, while the influence under which this is done is from the grace of God alone. This is the doctrine which is clearly contained in the words of St. Paul, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it

of God;" the ideal Christian of Methodismis "a perfect man," "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." (Eph. iv, 13.) Each of these points of view can be traced to the personal experience of the three great Reformers, forming, in each case, an epoch, not merely in the life of the Christian Church, but also in the development of Christian doctrine. In Calvin's experience the struggle was for victory over himself, and for entire subjugation to the will of God; and hence, the material principle of his theology became the divine decree, as fixing the salvation and damnation of each and every man. In Luther's experience, the struggle was for the forgiveness of sin; and so he came to look at all Christian doctrine from the point of view of justification by faith, the material principle of his theology. In Wesley's experience, the struggle was for entire sanctification; and so, in his study of the doctrines of the Bible, he looked at them all from this higher stage of the religious consciousness, and perfect love became the formal principle of his theology.* To "spread holiness" was recognized in the beginning, and is recognized to this day, as the mission of Methodism. No candidate can be admitted into full orders in the Methodist ministry until he answers the following questions: "Are you going on to perfection? Do you expect to be made perfect in holiness in this life? Are you groaning after it?"† On no point of doctrine is the theological literature of Methodism so ample as on this; besides the copious treatment of the subject by Wesley, Fletcher, and

is God that worketh in you both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure;' where, not only the operation of God, but the co-operation of man, are distinctly marked; and are both held up as necessary to the production of the grand result—'salvation.'"

See also Fletcher on the "Three Great Dispensations of Grace," *Works*, Vol. III, 166, *seq.*

* "*Quest.* What was the rise of Methodism, so called?

"*Answ.* In 1729, two young men, reading the Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it, and incited others so to do. In 1737, they saw holiness comes by faith. They saw, likewise, that men are justified before they are sanctified; but still holiness was their point. God then thrust them out, utterly against their will, to raise a holy people. When Satan could no otherwise hinder this, he threw Calvinism in the way; and then Antinomianism, which strikes directly at the root of all holiness." (Wesley, *Works*, Vol. V, p. 212.) This passage is cited in the first paragraph of the *Methodist Discipline*, in the Address of the Bishops, giving an account of the rise of Methodism.

† *Discipline*, Part II, Chap. II, § 11.

Watson, we have separate and thorough monographs by Treffry, G. Peck, J. T. Peck,* Foster, and others.

We have thus sketched the fundamental principles of Methodism chiefly from the materials furnished in Dr. Warren's pages. In closing his work, he gives a summary judgment upon the theological merits of the Methodist system as a whole, comprised in the following points. First, the Methodist theology corresponds better than any other to the object and end of the revelation of salvation by Christ. Secondly, it is the only theology which completely explains all the facts and phenomena of the religious life. The consciousness, in every converted soul, of the workings of the Spirit as its only source of peace and light, is inexplicable on the semi-Pelagian theory of the Romish Church. The moral and religious phenomena of the lives of many men before their conversion as well as the sanctity of many believing Christians, are inexplicable from the Lutheran or Calvinistic stand points. The Methodist doctrine, on the other hand, of the universality of grace, and of its various dispensations, finds a place for every phenomenon, from the inspiration of patriarchs and prophets under the old dispensation, down to the latest cry of a sinner for pardon, or the last struggle of a believer for sanctification of life. Thirdly, the practical influence of this theology, both as to the experience of believers within the Church, and to the fixing a sense of responsibility upon unbelievers without, is more beneficent and fruitful than that of any other. Fourthly, its evangelical character and power are shown by its fruits in the history and active life of Christianity. Millions have been brought to God under the preaching of Methodist doctrines within little more than a century; not in communities, by the command of princes; but by individual conversions, soul after soul. Nor has its indirect influence upon other churches been less marked and powerful. "Within that little circle, (the Methodist club at Oxford,) remarks a writer of another communion, "were the men commissioned to kindle God's fire upon earth, and to execute a work the like of whichhad not been seen since the Lutheran reformation. . . . That something of vital Christianity exists among professed believers of every name; that the doc-

* The title of Dr. J. T. Peck's work, *The Central Idea of Christianity*, is in full harmony with the formal principle of Methodism.

trine of justification by faith is generally understood and preached; that we are not blind Pharisees, or dead Formalists, or practical Socinians or Deists, we may trace the cause, in great part, we cannot tell how largely, to the holy club of Oxford Methodists." * The practical movements of modern Christianity, namely, the tract societies, missionary societies, anti-slavery, etc., can all be traced to the original impulse of Methodism.

The fifth and last point in this summary judgment is, that the Methodist conception of Christianity, that is, its theology, is more complete, catholic, and symmetrical than any other. This is at once accounted for and illustrated, first, in the personal character and culture of Wesley, as compared with Luther and Calvin; a character and culture which even hostile critics must admit to have been higher, more perfectly balanced and more catholic than that of either of the other great Protestant Reformers. Secondly, from the nature of the revival of the eighteenth century compared with that of the sixteenth, it followed, that the theological system which sprang from the latter should excel in symmetry and coherency that of the former. The Reformation was a *reaction* against Romish errors; and its thought, as is the case in all reactions, was limited by its very function of protest and of strife. But Methodism was no reaction, except against sin; a remark due to Isaac Taylor, who, with all his errors, saw deeply into the essential nature and function of early Methodism.†

We have thus given an outline of Dr. Warren's "Introduction to Systematic Theology." It will suffice to show that he has brought to his work a thorough grasp of the subject, a wide and comprehensive view of its relations to the development of Christian life and thought, and an amount of theological learning which will enable him to treat it, in all its branches, with full reference to all phases of opinion. In reading his Introduction, we have often been reminded of Twesten's

* *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1864, p. 133.

† "Puritanism was to a great extent, a reaction only; and so, too, was that profligacy and impiety which broke over the land when Puritanism met its political overthrow. But the Methodism that soon followed was no reaction which might have been foreseen; for it rose without visible causation; it came from above; it found its lodgment in the bosoms of two or three, the chosen instruments of Heaven; and, as was its commencement, such its progress."—*Wesley and Methodism*, p. 295.

*Dogmatik.* Dr. Warren has Twesten's clearness of apprehension, his fullness of learning, his accuracy of discrimination, and his profoundness also of insight. We trust that his work will not remain, like Twesten's, a noble fragment only.

The superiority of Dr. Warren's method is apparent, even from the statement of it afforded by the "Introduction;" but of course it can be fully tested only by its full development in the body of his work. We have little fear of the result; may God spare his life and health until his task is fully accomplished! In the part of the work that lies before us, we detect a tendency to overlay his matter with authorities. Of course, however, fullness of citation and reference is to be expected in an "Introduction," which is bound to give the literature of the subject discussed; and it is quite possible that even this warning is entirely unnecessary.

---

## Art. IX.—SPIRIT OF THE SOUTHERN METHODIST PRESS.

If our North and South are ever to attain the blessing of peace and oneness, the harmony must begin, as many believe, where it was first broken, between the northern and southern Churches; and especially between the northern and southern Methodism. At any rate, they think it desirable that those two Methodisms should hear and *understand each other.* And this can be done only through their proper organs, the press. As it is, however, the periodicals of each Church are read only within its own region. They revolve, like two different systems, each around its own center, in circles adjacent but never cutting. Each Church thereby has its own set of ideas, its own hostilities and charges against the other, its own self-justifications and self-glorifications; but of all the correspondent ideas and notions within the other circle they are decidedly ignorant.

There are generous and noble Christians among us who judge the Methodist Church, South, by the acts of the southern military authorities, and of the governors and legislatures, instead of by their own organs of principle and sentiment; which is about as fair as to judge New York City Methodism by our municipal government. We hear others, who have never fairly listened to one clear, unquestionable utterance from the Methodists of the South, pronounce them incorrigibly disloyal impenitent rebels, who only wait the means for

another outbreak. Others hold them responsible for all the guilty reluctance of southern state governments to grant safety, security, the right of testimony, and the means of improvement to the negro. Others assure us that they are fierce and defiant, one and all flouting at every proposition of conciliation. We do not now say whether these statesments are true or false; but we purpose, in a few brief pages, by extracts from its periodicals, to give southern Methodism a chance of saying something for or against itself. Surely no fair man can say that this is more than fair play.

We will quote their utterances at present on *three great points*, namely, Loyalty and Peace, Negro treatment, and Church conciliation.*

In regard, first, to LOYALTY AND PEACE. Immediately after the surrender of Lee, three of the bishops, Andrew, Paine, and Pierce, issued manifestoes advising loyalty, peace, and good-citizenship, "avoiding bitterness." The bishops, in their pastoral address, said:

We cannot close our address without an urgent and explicit recommendation to you, to adjust yourselves as citizens of the United States promptly, cheerfully, and in good faith, to all your duties and responsibilities. Whatever may have been the opinions, positions, or prejudices of any of you concerning the social and political changes that have occurred in the Government, we deem this course to be called for on your part, both by a sound judgment and an enlightened conscience.

Bishop Paine said:

Finally, having always disapproved of using the pulpit to discuss political questions, in which angry passions are sought to be aroused, he solemnly and deliberately advised his countrymen on the east side of the Mississippi river—and if his voice could be heard he would speak to those on the west side also—to resume in good faith their former positions as law-abiding and useful citizens. And, in closing my remarks, I can with more propriety address my brethren in the ministry who are present, and say to them all to use their influence, both publicly and privately, for the promotion of peace and quietness among all classes, and especially among the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Bishop Pierce said:

Accepting the issues of the war as the will of God in reference to the unity of the nation and the Government, let us all lead a quiet and peaceful life, in all godliness and honesty. Do not leave your loyalty in doubt by unmanly repinings—by querulous complaint, or by refusing the terms of offered amnesty. Qualify yourselves for the duties of citizenship—for the speedy restoration of civil government. Let us seek to repair the desolations of the land by a prompt and vig-

* We may here note that in our late article on the "Methodist Churches North and South," we had no intention to criticise the management of our necessary border battle, as managed by the able and energetic brethren—a Crary, a Cox, a George, and others—whose duty called them to that contest. Too distant to pronounce any personal opinion, we entertained no other presumption than that the battle, waged as it was by good and true men, was waged wisely and well. We were discussing not the immediate war policy on the border, but the future peace policy of the two great Churches.

orous industry, and prevent the further demoralization of society by multiplied words of faith and love.

The "Episcopal Methodist," October 11, says:

LOYALTY OF SOUTHERN METHODISM.—There is a studied and persistent effort made by the northern religious journals to impress the public mind with the conviction that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in the maintenance of its independent ecclesiastic organization, is disloyal to the Government. It is asserted that she is nursing treason, fostering secret secession, and laying schemes by which to fasten the chain of slavery again upon the freedman. The Southern Methodist Church to-day is more thoroughly loyal to the Government, more to be trusted, than the Northern Methodist Church. We are tired of strife and excitement. We intend to seek peace and pursue it. Our oaths have been taken in good faith, and we intend to keep them; and "as much as in us lies," we intend to live in peace with all men. We "pray for those in authority, that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty." These avowals and pledges have been given to the Government, and we shall sacredly observe them; and in due time, we shall prove our fidelity and trustworthiness.

Again, (October 25) the same paper says:

To the great discredit of the cause of God, a furious strife has been raging between the two sections of the American Church for several years, and, sad to recite, since the clash of arms has subsided. Where the world had a right first to expect the overtures of peace, it has been forced to witness the last demonstrations of hostility. Ecclesiastical combatants brought up the rear with a charge of their heaviest artillery, and their batteries are yet muttering the hoarse thunder of defiance along lines long since abandoned by contending armies. Is this the spirit of the Gospel? Are Christians the last to leave the field?

The "Southern Christian Advocate," October 26, says:

We repeat, war, ecclesiastical polemics, are not to our taste; and we are resolved hereafter to avoid them as much as circumstances and duty will permit. And, happily, we think that circumstances will favor us. On the great question of the day, which brings down a host upon us seeking our destruction, there is no division among ourselves. No controversy seems likely to spring up in our own borders, as to whether we shall remain firm to our organization, or give way before the attacks from without. Everywhere, preachers and people—with rare exceptions—have resolved to stand by their colors. Argument, controversy, are not necessary to keep them true to their Church. If we enter that field, it is against those who have already made up their minds to hear nothing, to believe nothing, that we can say. They have prejudged us; resolved beforehand that we are rebels, sinners, apostates, who need purgation; that we cannot, or do not, tell the truth, when we profess to speak our own sentiments or declare our purposes; that the most Christian utterances of our chief pastors are but an "affectation of sanctimony;" and, therefore, it is like darting straws against the wind, to say anything more to them on the subjects in hand. Truth is not advanced—only more bitterness, and wrath, and malice elicited. We may then content ourself hereafter generally with reproducing their choice sayings, to show how bitterly they hate or how supremely they despise us, believing that this alone will be sufficient warrant for the course our people propose to pursue, and for their general repugnance to uniting with the northern Methodists. The lamb does not generally seek the society of the wolf. What our persecutors say will be quite enough to establish our people in their purpose, without our endeavoring to answer any of the calumnies heaped on us.

The same paper, October 5, says:

How it may please Providence to dispose events, none can foretell. We hope for peace. We pray for peace. We take our position under the Government to promote peace. Wronged, cruelly wronged as we are by these fanatical men—wronged in our motives, our aims, our ends; wronged as citizens, as Christians,

as men—our duty must not be forgotten, our temper must not chafe, our patience must be enduring, our heroism calm and persistent. Although the days are dark, yet we may rest assured that Providence has restored us to the Union, and the Union to us, for purposes and ends wise and beneficent, and reaching far into futurity. A great effort will be made at the North to nationalize the animus of the pulpit, and thus shape the Government to its spirit. Another terrible struggle is inevitable unless the acrid temper of the extremists at the North is radically changed. Nor is it outside of the bounds of probability, that Providence may so overrule the removal of slavery as to qualify us for the task of defending American Institutions against the dangerous inroads of Puritanism.

The spirit of Jesus is the spirit of love, and of power, and of a sound mind; if any Northern missionaries to the negroes of the South come among us in that spirit, let them find that we are "also Christ's." When they come, let them find us before them in love and good works, so that even our adversaries cannot say aught against us.

Our Conference action on this subject will be looked to with special interest by both North and South. Methodism in Virginia must not disappoint the just expectations of its friends. The Conference may furnish such an exposition of character in connection with this matter, as shall be to its glory in the days to come. Let us so act, that men shall "account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover, it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful."

These utterances of the "Southern Christian Advocate," seem to us not unworthy a Christian spirit, and two Churches animated by that spirit need not quarrel over the negro they are both seeking to elevate.

In regard to NEGRO TREATMENT the "Southern Christian Advocate," September 21, says:

Our treatment of the blacks should be such as to stimulate their labor, and to give them every possible aid in making that labor productive. We believe southern people are disposed to do this, from an interest in the negro, from old association, from a sense of justice and from compassion. If these motives fail to secure to him sympathy, direction, and aid in the judicious and profitable employment of his labor, then let self-interest appeal for him. The class must be supported. If it does not support itself, the whites must do what it fails in: do it, at least until production by the class equals its consumption. We should do all we can to hasten that result, not by promoting the diminution of the race, but by stimulating its industry. Christianity, humanity, forbid the former, a wise economy recommends the latter, course; for that point reached, addition to the general wealth begins; and not only is the white man's burden removed, but the other race begins to promote the material prosperity of the country.

It would be as unwise in the whites to discourage or defeat the blacks in their efforts to work, as unwise to withhold from them whatever aid we can give them, as it would be in the head of the poor family, to hinder or throw obstructions in the way of the development of the capabilities and industry of his dependent children. Every increment to their self-sustaining power is so much subtracted from his burden, or else so much added to the resources of the family; and when resources exceed the daily or annual demands of life, then wealth begins to accumulate. As the father would tenderly nurture the child, and stimulate, encourage, and direct his labor to bring it to the productive point, so a wise political economy would impel southern people to do the same by the negro.

Again, November 16, the same paper says:

Were it not that a powerful and unexpected temptation to the fostering of prejudices against our late slaves has partially beclouded the sober Christian judgment of many of our people, there would be no occasion to argue either the importance or the obligation of the Churches doing all in their power to maintain whatever of

morality and religion may be found among the negroes, and to increase them a thousand fold. For a little while, there was much irritation against the blacks, for their ungrateful behavior toward those who had always been their best friends; but this temper is giving way to one more rational and more Christian. The consequence is, that questions of Christian duty come before us and press upon us imperatively; for they are not to be dismissed by our passions, antipathies, or prejudices.

The Church is to give the Gospel to the people; to those around her altars: to the poor. The duty is no less ours now than it was before the slaves were emancipated. It is as much our duty to look after their spiritual interests as it is to send missionaries to the Indians or to China. And what is our duty is our interest—in this case the interest of the entire community. It is the province of the Church to inculcate all morality, to counteract all vice and crime. The negro more than ever needs the teachings and restraints of Christianity. The control over his habits and manner of living once exercised by a kind and judicious master is no longer felt. Nothing can so well take its place as religious principle.

The "Richmond Christian Advocate," October 26, says:

If northern Christians do half as much for the negro as they declare they intend to do, we will rejoice; but we cannot rejoice in advance of facts. We shall not hinder them by word or act. They are committed, by ten thousand high-sounding professions of zeal in this matter, to do great things. But while we boast of no great wealth, and a very humble share of piety is all we claim, yet, when the genuineness of our regard for the colored race is brought fairly to the test, the logic of facts will vindicate us. Now is the time for us to show, by ecclesiastical action and personal labors, how ready we are to answer to the demands of the hour.

In regard to Church Conciliation, Dr. McFerrin says in a letter to the "Southern Christian Advocate," September 21:

To say in advance, that we will entertain no proposition for fraternal relations is both unwise and unchristian. We will, the whole Southern Church will, entertain any proposition coming from the North for fraternal relations, when that proposition comes from a proper source, and with reasonable and Christian conditions and suggestions. No, sir, we will reject no one, nor any body of Christians, who come to us in the spirit of our Master and with broad, Bible, equitable, generous Methodistic proposals. We are willing to meet any body of Christians on the platform of the New Testament.

But no proposition has yet been offered; no official communication has yet been made to us as a Church: and perhaps none ever will be. There are brethren at the North who respect us, who love us, who are willing and anxious to fraternize with us; aye, are anxious to be *one* with us; meeting us on the common-platform of Methodism, giving us the right hand of fellowship, and recognizing us as equals, extending to us and receiving from us all the rights, privileges and immunities of the Church of God—of two great branches of the same family. Such men we honor, such ministers we love. But alas! I fear they are in the minority.

Dr. Rosser, late editor of the "Richmond Advocate," says in the "Episcopal Methodist," November 15:

The South is ready for reunion. The following is one of the resolutions adopted by the Southern Convention in Louisville, in 1845:

"*Resolved*, That we cannot abandon or compromise the principles of action upon which we proceed to a separate organization in the South; nevertheless, cherishing a sincere desire to maintain Christian union and fraternal intercourse with the Church North, we shall always be ready kindly and respectfully to entertain, and duly and carefully to consider, any proposition or plan having for its object the union of the two great bodies in the North and South, whether such proposed union be jurisdictional or connectional."

If there be no hope of reunion, there is hope (though it be against hope) that fraternal relations may yet be formed between the two great Churches. And of this subject, also, the South is ready.

First. The South, in 1848, through its delegate, Dr. L. Pierce, proposed to the North "the establishment of fraternal relations and intercourse." The proposition was rejected on the ground of "serious questions and difficulties existing between the two bodies." Dr. Pierce replied: "The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, can never renew the offer of fraternal relations between the two great bodies of Wesleyan Methodists in the United States. But the proposition can be renewed at any time, either now or hereafter, by the Methodist Episcopal Church."—*Journal General Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, 1850, pp. 188–190. By reference to the protracted and pompous discussion on the occasion, it will be found that the "serious questions," etc., all merged in the conceit that the Southern Church was a "proslavery Church."—See *Debates General Conference North*, 1848, published in northern journals at the time. A fatal conceit, fancy, error! Again, it is here unequivocally affirmed, the Southern Church never was a proslavery or antislavery Church, but the true primitive Methodist Church, as has been again and again defined and proved in these papers. Manly, wise, and fortunate would be the renunciation by the North of this old, pernicious error, that has so long sustained the resolution to rend and ruin the unoffending and innocent Southern Church. Renounce that error, and why may not Jacob and Esau cordially shake hands in fraternal intercourse? It is worthy of remark, that while Dr. Pierce and Dr. Dixon, delegates from different portions of Methodism, were on their way to Pittsburgh, the former said to the latter: "You will be received and welcomed as a messenger of the Church, while I shall be refused and rejected." Dr. Dixon "warmly" replied, "I hope not; if you are rejected, it will be the occasion of everlasting regret to me."—*Report of Dr. Pierce, Journal General Conference Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, 1850. p. 192.

Secondly. The Southern General Conference of 1850, in St. Louis, ratified the action of Dr. Pierce in the following resolution:

"That we cannot, under their [northern] acts of rejection and refusal, renew our offer of fraternal relations and intercourse; but will at all times entertain any proposition coming from the Methodist Episcopal Church to us, whether it be by written communication or by delegation, having for its object friendly relations, and predicated of the rights granted to us by the plan of separation adopted in New York, 1844."—*Ibid.* p. 193.

It is doubtful whether ecclesiastical history contains such an example as this of Christian affection, forbearance, willingness to forgive, and readiness to form friendly relations, if reunion be impossible, with a former Christian brotherhood. But examples are not wanting of the insensibility and repulsiveness of the adverse party.

Thirdly. The southern bishops, in their pastoral address, issued from Columbus, Georgia, August 16th, 1865, after referring to the "ineffectual mission" of Dr. Pierce in 1848, adds: "We hold ourselves acquitted of any breach of Christian duty that might appear. But if at any time they should formally and officially make the same offer to us, the door would be open for its consideration. This was in 1848. They have since made us no such offer. There the matter *rests*, and we might well be excused from any further reference to it."

Such is the friendly attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, toward the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States.

Similar and still stronger utterances occur in a letter to the "Southern Christian Advocate," (which we have mislaid,) by Rev. Dr. Summers, late editor of their "Quarterly Review." Indeed, we understand the unanimous and settled ground of the Church South to be this: *We, the Church South, made the last formal proposition for recognition or union, and that was formally rejected; we now stand permanently ready, not to make further*

*official offers, but to hear and consider in a Christian spirit whatever propositions the Methodist Episcopal Church sees fit to make.*

From these extracts, uncontradicted as we find them, we, *first*, infer that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, whatever its past animus, professes to renounce every thought inconsistent with future loyalty to our government and peace with our states and people. We, *second*, infer that toward the negro, whatever the irreligious and the politicians may do, southern Methodists profess their purpose to be humane, Christian, parental. They mean (so they profess) to meet in the spirit of Christ the Northern missionary who comes in that true spirit. They mean, so far as their means permit, not to be outrivaled in deeds of Christian goodness to the lowly. We, *thirdly*, infer that the Church South affirms that, historically, she made the last offer of fraternity to our Church, even under the expectation of a humiliating rejection; that she has ever since been the repelled party; and yet, that at this present time, if reunion does not come, it is not because she is not Christianly ready for its coming. So they profess; and these professions were not addressed to outside ears, but were intended for home consumption. Let our readers judge of their validity.

## Art. X.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### PROTESTANTISM.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

Church Congress.—The annual Church Congress was held, according to appointment, in October, at Norwich, under the presidency of the bishop of that city. It was well attended, and seems to have not been inferior to any of its predecessors. In fact, the idea of these Church Congresses is becoming decidedly popular, and their success thus far has been sufficiently great to commend to all religious denominations the consideration of the question, whether in addition to the constitutional conventions of the Connection and of the Connectional Society, a free annual gathering of members of the denomination for a full discussion of all denominational interests would not be a desirable addition.

Of the questions discussed before the recent Church Congress at Norwich, none attracted a more universal interest than the reform of the "Court of Final Appeal." The tribunal thus designated is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as the highest Court of Appellate jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes. This board, consisting in its majority of laymen appointed by the Crown, has thus been for the Church of England what the Court of Rome has been for the Roman Catholic Church, the tribunal which had to give the final decision on the most important Church questions. It is only very recently that English Churchmen began to feel the abnormal and disgraceful condition in which their Church was put by this submission to a body of politicians. The first case that aroused a violent opposition was that of Mr. Gorham, a clergyman, who boldly denied the doctrine of the English Church concerning baptismal regeneration. The other Protestant bodies of

course generally sympathized with the views held by Mr. Gorham; still we cannot but find it very creditable to the High Church party that they were shocked in seeing that any, however fundamental, doctrine of their Church was at the mercy of a body of men appointed by the Crown, and whom no law prevented from being the worst opponents of the Church which they actually governed.

A few years later, another case aroused a still more profound opposition to the power of the judicial committee. A theological movement which had almost spent itself in Germany began to agitate the religious mind of England. Six clergymen, with one lay colleague, became the pioneers of the new opinions by publishing the famous volume of the, "*Essays and Reviews.*" Both the High and the Low Church parties loudly protested against permitting doctrines so glaringly inconsistent with the whole history of the Church, to be openly advocated by its ministers. The bishops were nearly unanimous in condemning these doctrines as dangerous heresies, and the clergy responded to the episcopal declarations with rare unanimity. Two of the offenders were cited before the judges of the Court of Arches, an ecclesiastical tribunal, who found some of the charges brought forward against them proved, and sentenced them to suspension from their benefices. The two clergymen appealed from this sentence to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which reversed the sentence of the court below, and decided in effect that very lax views on inspiration and future punishment did not so trangress the latitude allowed to clergymen as to subject them to penalties.

It was natural that such a decision should arouse the most intense indignation, and should greatly strengthen the desire of a radical reform of the "Court of Final Appeal."

Ever since, this reform question has greatly agitated the Church of England. At the recent Church Congress three elaborate papers were read on the subject, by Archdeacon Randall, Sir Robert Phillimore, and Sir William Jones. Archdeacon Randall described, in strong and true terms, the degraded condition of the Church, but he nevertheless confined himself to suggesting that certain bishops should be selected by their brethren as members of the Judicial Committee, that the minority should publicly state the grounds of their dissent, and that Privy Council judgments should not be binding on the Privy Council itself. Sir Robert Phillimore, who, as judge of the Court of Arches, is himself a layman, on ecclesiastical matters does not even go this length. He only desires that all bishops should be removed from the Judicial Committee, and formed into an independent board, to which questions of doctrines should be referred.

That both these remedies, if adopted, would be insufficient to cure the evil, is obvious. Both would leave to the Judicial Committee a controlling influence over the doctrines of the Church, and would, therefore, by no means prevent the efficient patronage by the state of the views of the Essayists and of Colenso.

The continued discussion of this subject in the Church of England can hardly fail to open the minds of even the English Churchmen, more and more, to the radical erroneousness of the entire system of State Churchism, and gradually prepare the way for its overthrow. If, as is reported, men of as great influence as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Gladstone are already strongly inclined in this direction, the progress toward attaining the separation of Church and State is certainly considerable.

## GERMANY.

THE GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS ASSOCIATION.—The general assembly of this society, whose beneficent operations abroad and popularity at home are increasing every year, was held in 1865, at Dresden, from September 5th to 7th. The society was established in 1843. From 1843 to 1858, or sixteen years, it raised one million thalers for providing the Protestants scattered in Roman Catholic districts with churches and schools. The second million was raised from 1859 to 1864, or in six years. From the report on the last year, 1864, we learn that this society aided 723 poor Protestant congregations, and the sum expended to this end was 195,634 thalers. Compared with the previous year, this shows an increase in the number of supported congregations of fifty-three, and in the amount of expenditures of 16,504 thalers. The following details of last year's report are of interest, as they illustrate the great usefulness of the society in the Roman Catholic and non-Christian countries:

| Countries. | Supported Congregations. | Grants. |
|---|---|---|
| America | 6 | 1,544 |
| Belgium | 10 | 1,224 |
| Germany | 399 | 100,990 |
| France | 27 | 10,947 |
| Holland | 7 | 690 |
| Italy | 3 | 1,685 |
| Austria | 206 | 63,955 |
| Prussian Poland | 43 | 6,611 |
| Portugal | 4 | 700 |
| Switzerland | 4 | 1,310 |
| Turkey | 17 | 4,835 |

During the year 1864, seventeen new branch associations, one district association, seventeen ladies' associations, were organized, and seven new churches were opened.

## MEXICO.

PROSPECTS OF PROTESTANTISM.—Mexico has prevented the spread of Protestism more effectually than any other Roman Catholic country of either America or Europe; but at length even this stronghold of religious intolerance has been conquered. Both the republican and the imperial governments have declared in favor of religious toleration; the number of foreign Protestant residents has largely increased in consequence of our war, and particularly in consequence of the downfall of the rebellion, and the few native converts to Protestantism can now profess their religion in public and begin with the construction of the first Protestant churches and schools. It is to be hoped that henceforth the American Missionary Society will pay a greater attention to the religious wants of Mexico than has been the case in the past. Hitherto only the American and Foreign Christian Union and American Bible Society have extended to them their operations, and it is especially the former society, which has been instrumental in establishing Protestantism in Mexico on a firm basis. Several recent numbers of the organ of these societies have contained valuable communications on the subject, the substance of which deserves to be widely known and preserved as the beginning of the history of Protestantism in our sister republic. The society has for several years supported a missionary laborer for the evangelization of the Mexicans.

First living on the border of Texas, Miss Rankins has subsequently availed herself of the religious toleration which Mexican Protestants now enjoy, and established herself at Monterey, the capital of the state of New Leon. Monterey is a city of about 12,000 inhabitants, and an important point in Northern Mexico, from which, as a center, operations can easily be extended in all directions. Miss Rankin commenced as long ago as ten years to teach Mexican girls, and after instructing them carefully in the Bible, she has sent a copy with each one to her family, and has thus introduced hundreds of Bibles and thousands of tracts into Mexico.

The seed thus sown has "borne good fruit." Miss Rankins, who was recently in this city, makes on this subject the following communications in the "Christian World:" "A native church has been organized, consisting of fourteen members, who give the most satisfactory evidence of genuine conversion. Four or five of these converted Mexicans are men fully competent to go forth as colporteurs, traveling from place to place, teaching and instructing both old and young in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, and the salvation of their souls. Nothing hinders them from going immediately into the field, already ready for the harvest, but the want of means by which their families may be supported.

"Rev. Mr. Hickey, agent of the American Bible Society for Mexico, is the only Protestant clergyman whom I know, and he is prescribed to his legitimate work, that of circulating the Scriptures. These inquiring Mexicans meet together as often as circumstances permit, read the Scriptures, pray, and mutually encourage each other in their Christian life. Although persecuted and threatened by the priests, and cast off by friends and neighbors, they are still increasing in numbers and strength.

"The native church in Monterey was organized two years ago by the Bible agent, and has in charge over it a Christian man who acts as teacher, meeting the members twice on the Sabbath, and twice during the week. Such are the indications of a permanent and aggressive work in Monterey, that an enlarged system of operations is demanded."

The great need of the Protestant congregation in Monterey is the possession of their own church and school. The priests, as in other Roman Catholic countries, are of course using their whole influence to prevent the Protestants from renting a house for their religious

meetings. The Protestant congregations are thus compelled to change constantly their places of meeting, and sometimes even the regularity of their religious assemblies is interrupted. The possession of a house of worship, of course, greatly facilitates the establishment of a permanent congregation, and largely adds to the number of casual attendants. Such a building can at the same time be used for the education of native youths of both sexes, many of whom may thus be prepared for spreading the doctrines of Protestant Christianity by teaching and preaching.

A number of priests in Mexico continue to declare themselves in favor of a religious reform. One of them is employed by the American and Foreign Christian Union to prepare a new translation of the Bible into Spanish. The liberal party, as a whole, is not only favorable to the establishment of religious liberty, but they are more opposed to the Church of Rome than ever. As soon as the star of the republic shall again rise, Mexico will offer unusual prospects for the spread of Protestantism.

## MADAGASCAR.

Success of the Protestant Missions.—The fears which the assassination of King Radama I. and the intrigues of French diplomatists and priests raised for the future of the Protestant missions in Madagascar, have fortunately not been realized. On the contrary, Protestantism has struck deep root in the island, and Madagascar already stands forth as an inchoate Protestant country, and as a conclusive proof that the labors of devoted Protestant missionaries—as Roman Catholic writers, with the great applause of an anti-religious press, so boastingly assert—have not been everywhere a failure. The facts which were recently adduced by the Rev. Mr. Ellis, the pioneer missionary of Madagascar, in a public address delivered in England, are an interesting contribution to the religious history of our age. It will be remembered by most of our readers, that during the enlightened rule of King Radama I. English missionaries, in the employ of the London Missionary Society, spread the first knowledge of Christianity, which was adopted by a large number of natives. To the bright prospects which thus began to open, the death of Radama, in 1828, seemed to put a stop. His widow, who succeeded him on the throne, hated the Christians, expelled the missionaries, and seemed to be determined to exterminate Christianity. A large number of the natives, however, gave the best proof of the soundness of their conversion by remaining firm during a severe persecution. The period of persecution again ceased and that of toleration recommenced when the pagan queen died in 1860, and was succeeded by her son, Radama II., who was known to be a friend of Christianity. The missionaries were allowed to return and to resume their operations. All restrictions upon the open profession of Christianity were removed, and it soon became evident, that notwithstanding the secrecy in which the native Christians had for years been compelled to hide the profession of their faith, their number had not decreased. On the contrary, intelligence was received from remote places which had never been visited by a European, that Christian congregations had been organized by native missionaries, and soon the number of Christians throughout the island began again rapidly to increase. The missionaries who have since been laboring in this interesting field are very sanguine of success; and Mr. Ellis, in the address to which we have already referred, expresses the hope that the next generation of the island will be predominantly Christian, and witness the overthrow of paganism.

America has as yet not been represented through its missionaries, in Madagascar. The bright prospects which there open for the permanent establishment of Protestantism, and the great efforts made by the Church of Rome to prevent this result, well deserve to attract the attention of all our missionary societies to this field.

# ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

## ITALY.

The Pope, the Government, and the Ultramontane Party.—In hardly any country of Europe have the people at the polls pronounced themselves more unanimously against the claims of the Papacy and the tendency of the Ultramontane party, than in Italy. The Italian Chamber of Deputies consists of 443 members. At the general election held in October, the Ultramontane

party did not succeed in electing more than about twelve members; all the others, though differing in their political views, are unanimous in rejecting firmly the interference of the Church in secular affairs, and in demanding the total abolition of the temporal power of the Pope, notwithstanding the threats of excommunication held out to every one favoring such a scheme. The number of voters in Italy is at present about 800,000; comprising all the intelligent and wealthy classes of the population, and as far as these are concerned the influence of the Church as the recent election has again demonstrated, is of very little account. A Chamber of Deputies like the one elected in October will protect the principle of religious toleration, and all the rights which since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy have been granted to Protestants. The address with which the king, in November, opened parliament, gives us reason to hope that great progress will be made in the way of ecclesiastical legislation. The king invites the co-operation of parliament for proper measures to establish the absolute separation between Church and State. If the government itself leads the way with regard to this important reform, there is no doubt that the vast majority of the chamber will approve it. Thus Italy will be first of the great countries of Europe to introduce into the old world one of the chief features of the civilization of our Union. The carrying through of this principle cannot fail to be of far-reaching influence upon the fate of the Papacy.

Catholic Congress.—As the Catholic Congress of Belgium did not meet in 1865, and that of Switzerland is too small a body to attract general attention, the Catholic Congress of Germany, which met in September, 1865, at Treves, was the only noteworthy demonstration of this kind by the Roman Catholics of Europe during the year. The organs of the Roman Catholic Church represent this vast congress, as well as its predecessors, as a signal manifestation of the vigor and vitality of their Church. They are led to this opinion by comparing the interest in the cause of the Church exhibited at these gatherings with the universal apathy formerly prevailing among the laity. Protestant observers who carefully study the history of these meetings in their relation to the bulk of the Catholic population, will arrive at a very different conclusion.

In the first place the small number of these meetings in Roman Catholic Europe is in itself a proof of the little vitality which is at present to be found in the Roman Catholic communion. The large majority of the countries of Europe are Roman Catholic, yet Germany, where Roman Catholicism has been for three centuries influenced and benefited by the contact with Protestantism, is the only country where these meetings take place regularly. Most of the countries have not even made yet an attempt. Only few energetic men from France, Italy, Spain and Portugal, appear at these foreign congresses to lament the apathy of their countrymen. Only Belgium, where the zeal of the Roman Catholics has been quickened by its struggle against liberalism, has attempted to follow the example of Germany. The first Belgian Congress, in 1863, attracted attention on account of its novelty; the second, in 1864, was, in the opinion of the Roman Catholics themselves, so vastly inferior to the first, that its managers thought best to abandon the plan of annual congresses, and concluded to hold one every other year.

With every new meeting of these congresses, it becomes more apparent that there is nowhere a nation which still believes in the principles of the Church of Rome, and that the influence of Rome on modern society is steadily decreasing. In Germany the Catholic Congresses have been at work for eighteen years, yet the popular mind is now as little influenced by them as before. The split in the Catholic districts between the "Catholic" and "liberal" parties has widened: yet an overwhelming and still increasing number of Roman Catholic districts prefer at all the municipal and state elections the liberal to the Catholic candidates. With one exception all the leaders in these congresses are men without influence upon their fellow-citizens, and noted for nothing but servile submission to the demands of Rome. Rarely a man arises among them whose talents command the attention of the world at large; and if at length such a man arises, he is almost sure to be disavowed by Rome. The speech of Montalembert on religious toleration at the Congress of Malines, which, after having been reproduced and eulogized by the Roman

Catholic press of every country, was formally disapproved by Rome, is a remarkable example.

Another proof of the weakness of the principles represented by these congresses is the fear of their leaders to indorse fully and frankly all the demands of the Pope. Zealous as they claim to be in the service of Rome, and unreserved as they appear to be in their adhesion to the late Encyclical and all other manifestoes of the Pope, they dare not embody in their resolutions the principles laid down in the Encyclical. They do not denounce liberty of the press, religious toleration, and other modern heresies, but confine themselves to complaining that they don't have the full share of the liberties which the anti-Catholic, legislation of their country grants to all. It is evident that the most zealous elements in the Roman Catholic population have not the courage to profess all the sentiments of Rome.

The work performed or reported at these congresses is insignificant if compared with the operations of the Protestant Societies. The progress of the Young Men's Catholic Societies is by no means more rapid than that of the Young Men's Christian Societies in Protestant countries. The reported success of the Society for Circulating Catholic Pamphlets, will dwindle down to little, if compared with the operations of the Protestant Tract Societies. The slow advance of the twenty-three millions of Roman Catholics in Germany in the establishment of an independent Catholic University, cannot challenge a comparison with the rapid increase of Protestant colleges in this country.

In some respects this congress itself bore testimony to the failure of the efforts of the Catholic Societies. It is an incontrovertible fact that although the majority of the Germans are set down as being nominally Roman Catholics, the overwhelming majority of the periodical press are very decided opponents of Roman Catholicism. The proportion of Protestant religious papers to Roman Catholic papers is at least three to one; and among the secular papers the Catholic Church can hardly be said to control one in twenty. How to remedy this evil has been the subject of animated discussion at every meeting of the Church Congress. But the progress made since 1848, when the first congress was held, is entirely unsatisfactory in the eyes of the leaders. At this year's congress it was again proposed to establish a central office for the Catholic press. But the committee of the Congress reported that the project must be abandoned, and it was clearly intimated that interest, money, writers, and everything else required was wanting. The school question was reported to be in an equally unsatisfactory condition No state government satisfies the Church of Rome, and the whole influence of the public school system is found to be adverse to the interests of Rome. It is thought, therefore, among the leaders of the Church party, that it will become necessary to organize everywhere private Catholic schools. All these facts taken together, there is but little doubt that the emancipation of the Roman Catholic population of Germany from the influence of Rome is making progress.

---

## Art. XI.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

The periodical theological literature of Germany has received, in 1865, a very valuable addition, by the publication of a new monthly at Gutersloh, Westphalia, under the title "Apology of Faith." The editors are the Rev. O. Andreæ, pastor at Nehein, Westphalia; Prof. O. Pfleiderer, of the University of Giessen; and Dr. Grau, of the theological faculty, of the University of Marburg. The two latter scholars are favorably known as authors of apologetic works, all of which have been referred to in former numbers of the *Quarterly Review*. As the name of the new periodical indicates, it has the special object to defend Christianity against the attacks of all the different schools of its modern opponents, and to demonstrate that Christianity alone is a safe basis of society and

of civilization. It will aid those whose faith has been shaken by modern science in reconfirming it, and those who have lost their faith in recovering it. To that end it will review the whole of modern literature and modern life, and show that there is no discord, but harmony, between true science, true progress, and religion. A large number of the prominent scholars of the evangelical school of Germany have promised their contributions. Among those whose names are well known in the United States, we mention Professor Dorner, of Berlin, Professor Ebrard, of Erlangen, Dr. Fabri, author of the work on Materialism, Dr. Harless, President of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Consistory of Munich, Professor Gess, of Göttingen, Prelate Dr. von Kapff, in Stuttgardt, Dr. Kliefoth, of Schwerin, Professor Luthardt, of Leipzic, Professor Van Oosterzee, of Utrecht, Dr. Wichern, in Berlin.

A number of Roman Catholic professors of theology have united to establish a new literary organ, for the review of the entire literature from the standpoint of their Church. Professor Reusch, of Bonn, well known as the author of several works on the New Testament, will be the editor.

A new posthumous work of the late Professor F. C. Baur, of Tübingen, is announced, giving his "Lectures on the History of Christian Doctrines. (*Vorlesungen über die Christliche Dogmengeschichte.* Part I. of Vol. I. Leipzic: 1865.) The entire work will consist of three volumes, the first of which will embrace the Doctrines of the ancient Church, the second those of the Church of the middle ages, and the third those of the Church of modern times. Part I. of the first volume, which has been published, extends over the period from the apostolical age to the Synod of Nice. In point of extent and completeness this work of Baur will take rank among the foremost works in this department of German theology. As regards the theological stand-point, the late author was well known as the leader of the negative school of German theologians.

Luther's theological views (which many High Lutherans regard as almost as important as the doctrines of the Bible) continue to be the subject of a number of new theological works. Among the most important of this class of works belongs that by Prof. Dieckhoff, of Rostock, on Luther's teachings concerning the power of the Church. (*Luther's Lehre von der Kirchlichen Gewalt.* Berlin: 1865.)

## FRANCE.

One of the most important recent publications of Protestant France is a new work by Count A. de Gasparin on "The Family, its Duties, Joys, and Sorrows." (*La Famille, ses Devoirs, ses Joies, et ses Douleurs.* 2 vols. Paris.) The name of the author alone is a guarantee that the new work is one which will be welcomed by all the evangelical Churches of the world. Count Gasparin is one of the most eloquent champions the Christian family has ever found. He declares open war against those enemies of the family who prefer, to its stern and beautiful duties, the cowardly peace of celibacy, which diminishes the existence and frequently extinguishes the tenderness of the heart, while the family inspires devotion, encourages noble works, sympathizes with all that is great and good, calls away from laziness and cowardice. In his description of the Christian family he takes his point of departure from God. It is God whose holy presence purifies it, sanctifies it, sustains it during the hours of sorrow, and awards to it pure and legitimate joys. Nowhere, Count Gasparin shows, the word of Jesus that one thing is necessary proves more true than in the family. The moral distance between a religious family, however poor and devoid of external advantages, and a family having all external advantages in abundance but no faith, is as wide as that between heaven and earth. A work by such an author and on such a subject will undoubtedly, by means of translations, soon be made accessible to all Protestant nations.

A new History of the United States, from the establishment of the first colonies to the first presidency of Abraham Lincoln, has recently been published by J. F. Astié, one of the regular contributors of the *Revue Chretienne.* (*Histoire de la Republique des Etats Unis.* 2 vols. Paris: 1865.) The work is introduced to the public by an introduction from the pen of Professor Laboulaye. Both Laboulaye and Astié are known as enthusiastic admirers of our American institutions. The author, says Professor Laboulaye in the preface, has undertaken to prove that

Christianity is the source of all liberty: that it has not only elevated the charac-

ter of woman in the family and abolished slavery, but it has emancipated the citizen, destroyed the old privileges, and founded modern democracy. . . . Liberty has a bad reputation in some of the European countries. It is only known by the ruins which it has caused, by the violence which it has produced; but ought this violence, these faults, these crimes, be attributed to liberty or to the men who have used its sacred name to dishonor it? The example of America gives us quite a different notion of liberty, and teaches us to respect and to love it. In this liberty which elevates the souls, enlightens and purifies the spirits and draws the hearts nearer to each other, we see the most perfect fruit of the Gospel. This modern liberty which rests on the co-operation of all, which rejects slavery, and protects minorities and the individual, has only made its appearance in countries which recognize Christ as their master. Let us recognize the tree by its fruits; let us understand that religious, political, social, individual liberty is the daughter of Christianity; instead of cursing and insulting it, let us try to know it, and perhaps, learning more of its divine beauty, we may finally love and embrace it. We shall introduce it to our hearths, and devote to it our entire lives. That America has done, and who will say that she has not fared well with it. May we be able to follow this example. May the same love and the same faith carry the civilization of the world toward the same future of good will, of peace, and of prosperity.

Works conceived and carried out in such a spirit can of course not fail to be effectual apostles of our institutions, both political and religious.

---

## Art. XII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

American Presbyterian and Theological Review, October, 1865. (New York.)—1. Demoniacal Possessions of the New Testament. 2. The Ministering of Christ and Christian Ministering. 3. Analysis and Proof Texts of Julius Muller's System of Theology. 4. The Relation of Christianity to the Present Stage of the World's Progress in Science, Civilization, and the Arts. 5. Slavery and Christianity. 6. Resume of the Geological Argument.

Bibliotheca Sacra, October, 1865. (Andover.)—1. What is the True Conception of Christian Worship? 2. New England Theology. 3. Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. 4. The Son of God. 5. Frederick Denison Maurice. 6. Editorial Correspondence. 7. Egyptology, Oriental Archæology and Travel.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, October, 1865. (Gettysburg.)—1. Church Music. 2. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. 3. Natural Theology. 4. True Greatness. 5. The Cross. 6. Marriage—Translated from Zeller's Biblisches Worterbuch. 7. Inauguration Addresses. 8. Pilate's Question. 9. "The Laborers are Few."

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, October, 1865. (Dover, N. H.)—1. A Good Minister of Jesus. 2. Oneness of the Church of Christ. 3. Woman's Position and Influence. 4. One of the Presumptive Arguments for the Divinity of the Bible. 5. Life and Times of Paul. 6. Dr. Lyman Beecher.

New Englander, October, 1865. (New Haven.)—1. The Revival of Letters in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. 2. Principles of Art. 3. A Divine Actor on the Stage. 4. The Word made Flesh. 5. The Rights of the Nation, and the Duty of Congress. 6. Ought Treason against the Government of the United States to be Punished?

## *English Reviews.*

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, October, 1865. (London.)—1. The Development of the Ancient Catholic Hierarchy. 2. Augustine. 3. Candlish's Cunningham Lectures. 4. Early History of Heathenism. 5. Scripture Songs of the Scottish Church. 6. The Skepticism of Hume. 7. Rome and the Roman Question in 1865. 8. Miscellaneous Intelligence. 9. German Theological Literature.

British Quarterly Review, October, 1865. (London.)—1. Matthew Arnold, Poet and Essayist. 2. Frost and Fire. 3. Palgrave's Central and Eastern Arabia. 4. The Judges of England. 5. Mrs. Browning's Poetry. 6. State Policy of Europe in 1865. 7. Lecky's History of Rationalism. 8. Notes on the United States since the War.

Christian Remembrancer, October, 1865. (London.)—1. Guizot on the Christian Religion. 2. The Early Struggles of the Church of Christ. 3. Theiner's Documents from the Vatican. 4. Palgrave's Arabia and the Arabs. 5. Zeller on the Greek Philosophy. 6. New Translations of Eastern Liturgies. 7. Faith and Life. 8. Gnosticism. 9. Ffoulkes on the Divisions of Christendom.

Edinburgh Review, October, 1865. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Journal and Correspondence of Miss Berry. 2. Life in the Criminal Class. 3. The Rock-cut Temples of India. 4. Life of Carl Maria von Weber. 5. Campbell's Frost and Fire. 6. Posthumous Writings of Alexis de Tocqueville. 7. Palgrave's Arabia. 8. The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland. 9. Sir Thomas Wyse's Peloponnesus. 10. American Psychomancy.

London Quarterly Review, October, 1865. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Cathedrals of England. 2. The Mariner's Compass. 3. The Resources, Condition, and Prospects of Italy. 4. The Poetry of Praed and Lord Houghton. 5. Blind People. 6. Field Sports of the Ancient Greeks and Romans. 7. The Gallican Church. 8. The Russians in Central Asia.

North British Review, September, 1865. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Mr. Mill's Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy. 2. Burlesque Poetry. 3. Carlyle's History of Frederic the Great. 4. Sir Benjamin Collins Brodie, Bart. 5. Mr. Russel on the Salmon. 6. Sensation Novelists: Miss Braddon. 7. "Frost and Fire."

Westminster Review, October, 1865. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Personal Representation. 2. Rationalism in Europe. 3. Capacities of Women. 4. Palgrave's Travels in Arabia. 5. The Holy Roman Empire. 6. The Doctrine of Nationalities and Schleswig-Holstein. 7. Mr. Grote's Plato. 8. Letters from Egypt.

## *German Reviews.*

Zeitschrift fur Historiche Theologie. (Journal of Historical Theology.) First Number, 1866.—1. Uhlhorn, The Literature of Church Theology, from 1851 to 1860.

The above number of the Journal of Historical Theology is more a work than a periodical, for the whole number is occupied by one

article, or rather by only the beginning of one article. No reader, however, will regret this want of variety, for the essay of Dr. Uhlhorn is one of the most valuable and interesting contributions to theological literature which has been made for many years. His object is to review all the German, and the more important non-German works which from 1851 to 1860, appeared in the Department of Church History. The works are grouped together in periods; the contents and essential points of each are concisely stated, and the new light which has been obtained from every particular work and from the works of one period, taken together, is clearly pointed out.

The first installment of the essay, in this number of the Journal of Historical Theology is restricted to the period of Ancient Church History until Constantine, and it subdivides the literature to be reviewed into seven classes.

1. Literature on the New Testament.
2. The Apostolical Fathers, and the Pseudepigraphs.
3. Gnosticism and Manicheism.
4. Montanism.
5. Patristics and History of Doctrines.
6. The Combat with Paganism.
7. The History of the Period in General.

For any one who wishes to acquaint himself with the grave theological controversies which have been carried on from 1851 to 1861, (or rather to 1864, for many of the works from 1861 to 1864 are embraced in this review,) and with their results, this article is absolutely indispensable. For we have as yet no other work, in any language, which in a so thorough and comprehensive manner lays before us the essential results of the literature of the last ten or fifteen years.

Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie. (Yearbooks of German Theology. Third Number, 1865.)—1. Steitz, The Doctrine of the Greek Church on the Lord's Supper in its Historical Development. 2. Paul, The Significance of the Resurrection of the Lord for the Faith of the Christian. 3. Distelmann, Remarks on 1 Cor. xv, 51. 4. Jahn, Remarks on Rom. viii, 18–23, with special regard to modern commentators.

We have already called attention in former numbers of the Quarterly Review to the very valuable essay of Dr. Steitz on the History of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Greek Church. In the above number of the "Yearbooks," we have the third instalment of the essay, which sets forth the gradual transition of the "symbolic" view of the Church to the "realistic" in the second half of the fourth century, and examines in particular the pass-

ages concerning the Lord's Supper in the Apostolical Constitutions, a fragment formerly ascribed to Irenæus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephraem the Syrian, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom and Maruthas. As in the former installments of his articles, Dr. Steitz quotes in full all the passages of the fathers, and thus enables the student to become fully satisfied as to the real views of the Greek fathers, without being under the necessity of turning to the voluminous original.

### *French Reviews.*

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*August* 1.—1. AM. THIERRY. The Struggle of Origenism at Rome—Death of Paula. 3. TAILLANDIER, The Poetry and the Poets of 1865. 4. BERNARD, Progress of Physiological Science.

*August* 15.—2. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America, at the Close of the War. Letters and Notes of Travel.

*September* 1.—CH. DE REMUSAT, Mahomet and Mahometanism, with reference to the new work on the Koran, by B. Saint Hilaire. 3. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America, (second Article: Life at the Watering Places, and the Northern Lakes.) 4. BOISSIER, The Roman Catacombs. 5. MAURY, The Recent Progress of Organic Chemistry. 6. MAZADE, The Crisis of Liberalism in Spain.

*September* 15.—1. ESQUIROS, England and English Life, (twenty-seventh article: Religious Life in the Country: the Presbytery, the Church, and the School.) 5. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America (third article. The Chicago Convention.)

*October* 1.—3. REVILLE, The Pagan Christ of the Third Century—Apollonius of Tyana, with special reference to the works of German Critics. 5. KERATRY, The French Counter-Guerillas in Mexico.

REVUE CHRETIENNE, *August*, 1865.—1. ASTIE, The Beginning of Abolitionism in the United States. 2. PEDEZERT, Marc Aurelius, (third article.) 3. HOLLARD, The Character of Jesus Christ.

*September* 1.—VALCOURT, The Sanitary Condition of the Armies during the Great Cotemporary Wars. 2. DELMAS. An Obstacle to the Realization of a Separation between Church and State in France. 3. BONIFAZ, The Christian Character of Corneille's Polyeucte.

## ART. XIII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*Christian Memorials of the War*; or, Scenes and Incidents illustrative of Religious Faith and Principle, Patriotism and Bravery, in our Army. By HORATIO B. HACKETT, Professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation in Newton Theological Institute. Pp. 252. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

These sketches we would not "willingly let die." It must have been a labor of love for the eminent author to gather and arrange them.

War is always terrible, and makes fearful havoc of homes, and hearts, and lives; but when before was war accompanied by so much of the power of Christianity as was the War for the Union? Many felt it a religious duty to fight for the Government; and one-seventh of the male members of the Churches are estimated to have volunteered, while many entire Churches were left with hardly a living man, either clergy or laity. The Christian bishop would "take our glorious flag, and nail it just under the cross." Pastors, in some cases, led the men of their flocks to the field. Neither Cromwell's Ironsides nor Havelock's Highlanders furnished greater heroes than were many of the Christian soldiers of our army. Trust in God for success; faith in Jesus inspiring courage in peril and battle; patience in the endurance of sufferings; peace and triumph in death on the field, in the hospital and prison; O! how numerous the instances from the general down to the drummer-boy! Battle-fields and camps have their holy places where the Son of God revealed himself as the Saviour. Armies were supplied and resupplied with copies of the New Testament; soldiers at a halt would take them from their pockets and read a chapter; cabins became Bethels; there were regimental Churches and regimental revivals; and eternity alone can tell how many thousands who left their homes unsaved became Christians in the army. Would that all our commanders had been such men as Foote, Mitchell, Howard, Sanders, and Shaw!

The volume before us contains one hundred and forty-three incidents, illustrating the above with other points, and giving us examples of the intelligence, earnestness, Christian principle and heroism of our brave men. They are only a few of the brightest jewels of our country, and none of them can we afford to lose. W.

---

*The Centenary of American Methodism.* A Sketch of its History, Theology, Practical System, and Success. Prepared by order of the Centenary Committee of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. With a Statement of the Plan of the Centenary Celebration of 1866. By JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1865.

Among its other good results our Centenary has called out Dr. Stevens to furnish the Church a miniature of his History of Methodism. Great and beneficial to the Church has been his mission as her historiographer, entitling him to her deepest gratitude and highest honor. He comes at the right period of her age: just early enough to rescue from total loss a great mass of her best reminiscences; just late enough to be able to contemplate her origin in a true historical perspective. It is her vindication and her

representation before the world. While such is the character of his elaborate work, this "diamond edition" was yet needed, compressing the story into sufficiently brief dimensions for the most casual readers, and cheap enough for universal diffusion. So will the entire whole of the Church understand herself. So will she advance in becoming a self-conscious and a most intelligent self-active Church.

It is divided into three parts, answering the three questions: What is Methodism? What achievements entitle it to a centennial birthday? What are its capabilities and responsibilities for the future? Answering the first question is a statement of her history, institutes, and doctrines. Answering the second, is a summary of the achievements of Methodism in its own growth and success; in its publishing institutions and published works; in its educational results, its Sunday-schools, missionary enterprise, patriotism, and miscellaneous aggregates. Answering the third, is a series of suggestive topics touching our Church progress for coming time, which should be implanted in the mind of every thinking Methodist and every Methodist who ought to think. While this is an invaluable manual for every Methodist's own use, it is just the pocket-piece to present to every outside inquirer, to every prejudiced depreciator, to every philosophic thinker whose attention has never been but can be awakened to the subject, and who may not have time or interest sufficient for a bulkier volume.

---

*History of Rationalism.* Embracing the Present State of Protestant Theology. By Rev. JOHN F. HURST, A.M. With Appendix of Literature. 8vo., pp. 643. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1865.

Mr. Hurst is known to our readers as one of the contributors to the pages of the Quarterly. He is a graduate of Dickinson, who, after a period of residence in Germany, entered the Newark Conference, and has illustrated in his own instance the *possibility* of happily blending the different characters of scholar, thinker, writer, earnest preacher, and practical pastor. The subject on which he writes has deeply interested his feelings, and its ample discussion has been a labor of love. His reading, as both the ample quotations and the extensive list of works in his Appendix show, has been great, for so brief a period of time. His work, in manuscript, has received the endorsement of some eminent critics, outside our Church, and its publication by our Concern (in connection with Scribner) will be welcomed by every friend of religious literature. We hesitate not to say that its perusal will richly reward our

ministry by the deep and varied interest of the subject, by the light it sheds upon the present intellectual and religious condition of Europe and America, and by the momentous lessons it furnishes in the great struggle now going on between high divine spiritual truth and the multiform infidelity of the present hour; an infidelity which either as a proud, pretentious transcendentalism would outblaze the luster of Christianity and claim to fling her into dimness and shade; or, as low sensationalism, would, with much scientific pretense, teach us that soul is but matter, that man is but animal, and that God is but cosmos. We should say more upon the work, but we expect a full review from a competent hand.

---

*Illustrative Gatherings for Preachers and Teachers.* A Manual of Anecdotes, Facts, Figures, Proverbs, Quotations, etc. Adapted for Christian Teaching. By Rev. G. S. Bowes, B. A. 12mo., pp. 464. Philadelphia: Perkenpine & Higgins. 1865.

We suppose that many a young preacher may really be aided by books like this; but the preacher who depends upon such aids is the worse for their use. We cannot imagine a Chalmers, a Wayland, an Olin, or a Summerfield leaning on such a sort of reed. But this kind of book is decidedly better than *skeletons* to be dressed with the investments of life, or those piles of homiletical crusts and scraps which are given in some of our commentaries for the young preacher to transmute into the bread of life. We never tried such a skeleton, or any of those scraps; but we should think them about the most difficult machine or material for sermon manufacturing conceivable. We should as soon think of making a poet with a rhyming dictionary, as a preacher with scraps and skeletons.

These Gatherings, however, have something of the freshness of a live literature. They are a series of choice anecdotes and beautiful sayings. The topics are ranged in alphabetical order. The authors, whose words are quoted, are worthy the compliment. But let no young minister be prevented, by habitual use of such aids, from acquiring a full mind and possessing a full heart; for it is out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

---

*Hours Among the Gospels;* or, Wayside Truths from the Life of our Lord. By N. C. Burt, D.D. 12mo., pp. 215. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. 1865.

Dr. Burt's volume belongs nearly with the treatises of Paley and Blunt, developing a very effective argument for the truth of the

sacred writings from "the undesigned coincidences" appearing in the accounts of the different writers. Phenomena of this kind never did and never can take place in forged documents. The argument is not only very convincing to the candid examiner, but it stands alone; no other sacred books or ancient documents furnish anything like it. An argument very conclusive of the truth of gospel and apostolic history can be framed by taking into one view the connections between the Epistles of Paul and the Acts and so the Gospel of Luke. No false documents in all literature furnish fibers of such natural and truthful relations.

## *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Apologetische Vorträge über die Grundwahrheiten des Christenthums.* Von Professor CHARLES ERNST LUTHARDT. 8vo. pp. xii. 266. Leipzic. 1864.

This work consists of ten apologetical lectures delivered in Leipzic in the winter of 1864, together with forty-five closely-printed pages of notes designed to confirm and illustrate the text. One month after its issue a second edition followed, and a third had to be printed five months later in order to meet the ever-increasing demand. No evangelical defense of the "Fundamental Truths of Christianity" has achieved such a success in Germany for a century. That such a book has found such a market is one of the best signs of the times now visible in the German Church. The author, a Leipzic Professor, but a few weeks ago elevated to the rank of Consistorial Counsellor, is one of the most active and versatile of the younger generation of German theologians, a general but moderate "New Lutheran," clear and graceful in style, not remarkably profound or original himself, but with a wonderful talent for translating other men's obscure and confused profundities into pellucid forms of expression.

The themes of his Lectures are as follows: 1. The Antagonism between the Christian and the Infidel View of the World Historically Traced. 2. The Contradiction of Being. 3. The Personal God. 4. The Creation of the World. 5. Man. 6. Religion. 7. Revelation. 8. History of Revelation. 9. Christianity in History. 10. The Person of Jesus Christ.

The first lecture gives us a rapid but sharply-drawn outline of the history of the struggle between Christian and Anti-Christian thought, from the beginning until now. In the second he reviews the contradictions of being, those of intelligence, feeling, will, of life as a whole, death, etc., and then shows the answer which

Christianity gives to our questions. This lecture reminds one of the corresponding Meditation of *Guizot*. The third grapples with the theistic problem, shows up atheism, establishes theism, and refutes the pretensions of pantheism. The fourth embraces among other things, a disposal of the astronomical, geological, and other objections which unbelieving devotees of natural science are wont to urge against the Christian view of the world, and especially of its origin. In the fifth, Darwinism, unity of the human race, the materialistic psychology, the Scripture doctrine of man and his destiny, are discussed. In the sixth, the essence of religion is set forth, prayer justified, and the relations of religion to civil and political life, to civilization, and to the present, discussed. The seventh embraces six points: necessity of revelation, sin, possibility of revelation, miracles, reality and truth of revelation, and finally, its relation to human reason. The history of revelation, in the eighth lecture, covers, of course, the historical developments of ancient Heathenism and Judaism in their relation to Christianity. The next is an eloquent presentation not only of the historical argument for the truth of Christianity, but also of that which may be drawn from its scope and adaptation as universal religion. The closing discourse fitly concludes the demonstration by presenting us Jesus Christ, as at once the explanation and the all-sufficient guarantee of our holy religion.

In point of style the work may be pronounced fully worthy of its author's distinguished reputation. A higher compliment could scarcely be given it. In reading its brief, crisp sentences, one can scarcely realize that one is perusing a production of a German divine; it seems vastly more like Cousin, almost like Victor Hugo. He has produced a work *popular* in the best sense of the word, and his success ought to induce others to follow in his footsteps. We hope our bishops will render our German candidates a permanent kindness, by speedily placing these lectures upon their *Plan of Study*, at least as a work to read. A suitable apologetical work has long been sought for them, but in vain; here, at last, we have one.

Before taking leave of Dr. Luthardt, we wish to say that his last considerable work before this (*Die Lehre vom freien Willen in seinem Verhältnias zur Gnade*, published two years ago,) is one of great value to all who interest themselves in the history of human speculation touching human freedom in its relation to grace. It embraces a learned and critical survey of said speculation within the Church from the beginning till the Reformation, and within the Lutheran branch of the Church from that epoch

down to the present day. So complete a history of Christian thought on this great and all-determining theme, cannot be found in any other work. The author's talent for reproducing the thoughts, principles, and systems of other men, here renders him the best of service. One can only regret that his plan did not allow him to treat of Pajonism, Edwardeanism, and other historical developments within the Reformed Church. Still, as it is, he has given us a monograph of rare and enduring value.

---

*Die Idee der Absoluten Persönlichkeit, oder, Gott und Sein Verhältniss zur Welt, insonderheit zur Menschlichen Persönlichkeit.* Von DR. J. W. HANNE. Zweite Auflage. 2 Bde. S. 553, 321. Hanover, 1865.

German authors are fond of projecting works of magnificent proportions. They desire to treat every subject from every conceivable point of view, historically, philosophically, controversially, in a word exhaustively, and hence they have to lay out their treatises on a mammoth scale. One consequence of this passion is a wonderful furtherance of human knowledge; but another consequence is, that the German literature is full of fragmentary productions, the massy and imposing foundations of grandly conceived towers which ambitious builders "began, but were not able to finish." Such a work is the one whose title is above given. It was the author's original design to set forth an exhaustive view of the idea of absolute personality. To this end of course the first step would be an investigation of concrete personality as presented to us in God and in man. Beginning with the first of these topics, the personality of God, he first proposes a history of the idea of God, from the earliest times until now. This history fills the two volumes before us. Having abandoned the idea of ever carrying his work forward to its conclusion, the author ought in this new edition to have given the part here issued its proper name, to wit: History of Speculative Theism in its conflicts with Pantheism and Deism. This title would have indicated the exact contents of a valuable work, the present one is only commemorative of an ambitious author's exploded dream.

An introduction of some twenty pages discusses the vital importance of the idea of personality for all human sciences, particularly for theology. The history itself is divided into four books. The first presents us with the history of the idea of God in the ante-Christian era of the world. The theology of Plato and Aristotle is here treated of at considerable length. The second book treats of the establishment and earliest modifications of Christian Theism in the primitive Church. The Old Testament doctrine of God is given only as a transition from the one book to the other, and should have received a fuller treatment.

This book closes with Augustine. The third conducts the investigation through the Middle Ages, and the fourth from the dawn of modern times to the present day. The latter fills the entire second volume. It possesses for non-German theologians a peculiar value from the fact that it discusses the relation of all great systems of modern German speculation to Christian Theism. In the pre-Kantian period our author distinguishes two speculative currents, a Pantheistic and a Deistic one. In connection with the former he treats of the theology of Des Cartes and Spinoza, and their significance for the history of Theism. Leibnitz marks the beginning of a new scientific conception. In the Deistic current Wolf, Locke, and Hume pass before us. Kant's influence on the development of Christian Theism is set forth with great explicitness; then come in their order Fichte and Hegel, after which the reactionary, anti-pantheistic efforts of Jacobi, the later Schelling, and Krause, the "*panentheist*," are duly set forth and critically reviewed.

Our author's style is fresh and readable. Here and there he betrays a little straining after effect, and not unfrequently precision of expression is sacrificed to the rhythm of a sentence. This, however, is so uncommon a fault in works of its class that it can easily be overlooked. Dr. Hanne wrote his work after recovering from an illness of some ten years' duration. He was at that time the pastor of a little country church in Salzhemmendorf. The first volume was issued in the spring of 1861, and before the second could follow it in November of the same year its author had become what he has since remained, an ordinary professor in the University of Greifswald. The new edition now leaving the press is unaltered. The author's theological stand-point may be inferred from the fact that he is a zealous co-operator with the leaders of the "*Protestantenverein*," his philosophical affinities from the circumstance that he almost entirely ignores Herbart in the work here noticed, and glorifies the later system of Schelling as far as it is at the present day safe for a thinking man to do so. The work which he now for the second time presents to the public has defects, but, as a special history of Theistic speculation, is the best we have in any language.

---

*Julius Stier. Gesammeltes aus der Zerstreuung. Herausgegeben von* Friedrich Stier. 8vo., pp. 251. Braunschweig. 1865.

Under this title a son of the late distinguished Dr. Stier publishes a collection of miscellaneous theological essays and reviews, originally contributed by his father to various theological periodicals of Germany. The selection, we are told, was made by Dr. Stier

himself. He had intended publishing them under his own personal supervision, but was prevented by death. (He was born 1800, died December 1862.) This is the more to be regretted from the fact, that all the papers were written at the very beginning of the author's theological career, and there is reason to think, indeed we may say positive proof, that not a few of the views herein advanced were essentially modified by subsequent study and experience. A liberal annotation by the hand of the author would have doubled the value of the work, both for the historical and for the theological student. The contents are as follows: I. *Miscellaneous Theological Essays.* 1. Biblical Interpretation, its Steps and Aim, (from Tholuck's Literarischer Anzeiger, 1836.) 2. Relation of the Apocrypha to Sacred Scripture, (Hengstenberg's Ev. K—Z, 1828.) 3. Rationalism and the Agende, (2 art. Ev. K—Z, 1830, 31.) 4. Account of Ram-Mohun-Roy, a Brahmin philosopher of East India, and of his attitude toward Christianity, (Theol. Nachrichten, 1825–26.) 5. J. F. von Meyer and Magnetism, (Ev. K—Z, 1830.) 6. Luther's Catechism, (two arts. Ev. K—Z, 1833, 34.) 7. Contributions to Keryktik [his name for the Science of the Art of Preaching,] (Brandt, Homiletische-Liturg., Correspondenzblatt, 1829–31, eight articles.) II. *Reviews.* 1. J. F. von Meyer's Glaubenslehre, (Ev. K—Z, 1833.) 2. Gerlach's New Testament, Vol. I., (Lit. Anzeig., 1837.) 3. Cl. Harms' Pastoral Theology, 1st Book, (Ev. K—Z, 1831.) 4. G. D. and F. W. Krummacher's Sermons, (Ev. K—Z, 1827–31.) 5. Fertsch and Möller, on Confessional Fees, together with a Closing Reply, (Ev. K—Z, 1830, '34, '40.)

The Essay on Biblical Interpretation is well known to all students of exegetical theology as a spirited attempt to vindicate to Holy Scripture a deeper and more spiritual significance than that sought after by the worshipers of the "Grammatical-historical method." This method he regards as only the first of three steps which the interpreter has to take. The second is the "pneumatical-symbolic," and the third, which is at the same the ultimate aim of the whole art, the "mystical-typical" interpretation. Though by no means free from questionable positions, the article did good service to the cause of sound evangelical exegesis on its first publication, and still deserves the perusal of every young expositor. The "Contributions to Keryktik" have been to a considerable extent incorporated into the last edition of Stier's *Keryktik*, and hence appear here properly for the third time. The other papers are of no great value to American theologians, unless it be to individual investigators of the history of German

theology, thirty to forty years ago, or to individual admirers of the lamented author.

---

*Die Weissagungen des Propheten Jesaia.* Prolegomena zu einem, neuen Handbuch der Auslegung. Von Dr. Fried Hosse. 8vo., pp. 80. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben. 1865.

Dr. Hosse is of the opinion that an Exegetical Handbook to Isaiah, combining in due proportion the critical and the practical, is one of the present *desiderata* of German theological literature. Such a handbook he proposes to issue, and as a kind of prospectus we have here the *Prolegomena* thereof, arranged in five chapters, as follows: I, The Composition of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah; II, The Critical Question in relation to the Genuineness of the Whole Book; III, Chronology of these Prophecies; IV, The Fundamental Ideas of Isaiah's Prophecy; V, Prophecy of Fulfillment. His division of the prophetic book is this: *First collection of prophecies*, ch. 1–12; *second*, 13–23; *third*, 24–27; *fourth*, 28–35; *fifth*, 36–39; *conclusion*, 40–66. The genuineness of the entire book ascribed to Isaiah is very clearly and convincingly argued, and the chronology of the different parts thoroughly investigated. The dissertation on the fundamental ideas of Isaiah's prophecy is of much interest. The fundamental ideas which our author here investigates are the following: "The Holy One of Israel," "The Servant of God," and "The Glory of God," whose visible revelation to all nations the prophet so often foretells. In the closing section, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," our author justifies the old distinction between literal and typical prophecies, but thinks it cannot in all concrete cases be sharply drawn and rigidly carried out. Of the exegetical ability of the new commentator of course we cannot judge until his work shall appear. The promise of these Prolegomena is, however, excellent.

---

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*The Intuitions of the Mind Inductively Investigated.* By Rev. James M'Cosh, LL.D. 8vo., pp. 448. New York: Robert Carter & Brother. 1866.

Though Dr. M'Cosh's great work has received both a book notice and an elaborate article (by the late Dr. Dempster) in our Quarterly, we avail ourselves of this beautiful new edition from the press of the Carters, to give it another emphatic approval. We know no work in the higher metaphysics more sound in its teachings, or more worthy the study of the young philosopher or

advancing theologian. It embodies, in our individual opinion, a philosophy generally true, and more perfectly accordant than any rival system with the doctrines of Christianity. We pass from its great developments of philosophic truth to the pages of revelation without a painful chasm, or sense of contradiction or difficult reconciliation. It is a true Christian philosophy.

By our intuitions the soul sees necessary truths; necessary, subjectively, so that the soul must *know* them; and necessary, objectively, so that they must be truths as known. Let these intuitions be analyzed, enumerated, and validly ascertained, and at once we know that much, what is *truth*. True, absolute *certainty* is ascertained. Amid the mists and twilights of doubt and skepticism true objective *reality* is described, outlined, and identified. Then know we where we are, what is before us, and what we are ourselves. These things we know, indeed, but partially; but so far as we know, we truly know; and the known is none the less valid because there is a large unknown beyond. No hand has delineated our intuitions so cautiously, so firmly, and so validly as Dr. M'Cosh's.

An acute critic in the "Nation," in the "Notice" of Dr. M'Cosh's philosophy, attempts to press against it the supposed fact that many notions have heretofore been esteemed intuitions which the progress of science has proved to be errors. And the query arises, If notions have been falsely imagined to be intuitive, why may not the intuitions of Dr. M'Cosh's philosophy be imaginary? People once intuitively saw that there could be no antipodes, no men walking on the other side of the globe with their heads downward.

Our own reply would be first a denial of the truth of the statement. There never was a time when minds could not *conceive* (in the sense of *mentally picturing*) a man walking like a fly upon the overhead ceiling. A painter never could draw two parallel lines approximating each other; but a painter, in any age, could paint a man with head downward treading the upper ceiling. And here, at start, is a *fundamental* difference. The approximating parallel lines cannot be framed in thought; the antipodal walker always could. Again, mind does conceive that under no conditions, in no age, or part of the universe, by no exertion of infinite power, could parallel lines be made to approximate; but no mind ever supposed that infinite power could not create and sustain a man, as well as a fly, able to walk on the ceiling. Here, then, is a second fundamental difference. The difficulty then is not in the conceivability or in the intuition of the thing. Where did it lie,

then? It lay, we reply, in reconciling the possibility of the actual occurrence of the thing with what were the then supposed surrounding facts of experience and laws of nature. Between such possibility and such laws, intuition saw a contradiction; and the intuition was right. And holding the laws as true, the mind concluded the antipodes impossible; and from the premises that was a valid conclusion. The error lay back, in the assumption of the truth of those laws, and of that assumption the intuition was not guilty. The error lay in supposing those facts of experience and science were real facts; but the intuition that saw the *contradiction* between the antipodes and the supposed facts was sound.

Mr. Mill at the present hour can conceive a man walking on the upper ceiling, just as easy and no easier than the ancients. But after he has *conceived* the mental image he has not approached any conviction that any gymnast can actually perform the feat. He cannot be made to (not *conceive* but) *believe* it. Why? Because it is contradicted by what Mr. Mill holds to be the settled course of experience. That contradiction Mr. Mill sees, perhaps, by intuition, and he sees validly. And, holding the experience as valid he is compelled to reject the ceiling-walker just as the ancients rejected the antipodes. Just so the error of the ancients was not in the intuition, but in their antecedent notions of general experience. So far as it was anterior assumption it was wrong; so far as it was intuition it was right.

---

*Voices of the Soul Answered in God.* By Rev. JOHN REID. 12mo., pp. 374. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1865.

The purpose of this volume is to show that the moral instincts of the soul demand the provisions made in its behalf by the system of evangelical Christianity. An incarnation of the Deity is required by the very nature of human thought, which both represents God as infinite spirit, and shapes him as a living person. The depth of human guilt as felt by the most truly developed moral natures of mankind demands an infinite redeemer. The true idea of a divine law broken, requires a divine repairer of the law's honor, and restorer of its authority. The guilty soul prophesies to itself a future misery requiring a divine sufferer. Human sorrow has to it a mysterious import, needing a divine sympathizer. The present ruin of the soul, its interior discords, the laws of deterioration under which its influence exists, utterly incapacitating it for self-recovery, and pointing to a perpetuity of ruin, demands nothing less than a divine restorer. The profound dissatisfaction of the soul, the element of disturbance in every mundane enjoyment,

the disgust in the very satiation of its earthly enjoyments, point to a divine satisfier, and indicate God as our ultimate and our home. Thus for man's moral demands the Christianity of the New Testament furnishes the corresponding supply. As a theory, therefore, the philosophy of the Gospel is absolutely true. As a method it is worthy our most unreserved and earnest acceptance.

Grant to the author his *doctrine of sin and guilt*, and all his deductions seem to us inevitable. Between the Calvinist and Arminian everything depends upon our view of a responsible will. But between evangelical Christianity and Pelagianism, including Unitarianism, Universalism, Rationalism, down to blank Deism, everything will depend upon the theory and the sense of sin. If there be nothing but violation of physical, social, and political laws, mere human offences against mere human regulations, then all the conceptions about divine atonements are mere vagaries. But if there be in human transgression something transcendental and abysmal, *aliquid sublime et divinum*, if such be the true interpretation of the universal sense of our race most deeply revealed by the deepest individual moral natures, then man must be an immortal being in order to meet the full penalty of his deep demerit. Nothing less than a divine saviour can substitute the claims of literal justice, and the whole system of provisions in the Christian scheme of redemption is a programme drawn up by his infinite wants. Mr. Reid's argument is almost purely psychological. He expresses in rather eloquent language those sentiments which he assumes the consciousness of his readers will verify. On the particular point of the true conception of sin he quotes the experimental language of Edwards, and the historical instance of Augustine. Perhaps the argument upon this point needed to be more full; or rather it may be that an entire volume, much more largely embracing the historical argument, is a desideratum in both doctrinal and experimental theology.

Mr. Reid has performed his work with signal ability. The theological thinker, the experimental Christian, the studious minister, will find rich thought in glowing language, and pregnant seed and provocative to further thought on every page.

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*Life of Horace Mann.* By his Wife. 12mo., pp. 602. Boston: Walker, Fuller & Co., 245 Washington street. 1865.

A vivid, inspiring book. It brings us heart to heart with an earnest, electric soul. The conscientious lawyer, the far-seeing,

indomitable educational secretary, the progressive politician, the fierce antagonist of the mighty Webster, (when he, too, bowed down to our great national Dagon,) the thorough, enthusiastic educator, the restless, indefatigable reformer—here again, we see his face.

This book is not an artistic biography. It is prepared in the style now so common—a series of letters and extracts from a journal, strung by a loving hand, on a slender thread of narrative. It is the man as sketched by himself and his wife. Obviously we must not expect to find in this volume a cold, juridical decision of the manifold controversies, reformatory, educational, religious and political, in which Horace Mann bore so conspicuous a part. It is the advocate and not the judge that we come to hear. Hearing thus we shall get that highest pleasure and profit that comes from real contact with a soul whose whole life was a galvanic thrill along the muscles of our age.

Born in 1796, in Franklin, Massachusetts, Horace Mann drew his first breath under the empire of that Ajax of New England Calvinism, Dr. Emmons. In an autobiographic letter he gives a painfully vivid narrative of the effects of high Calvinistic preaching upon his childish conscience and sensibilities. He tells us, in his peculiarly intense style, of nights made sleepless by the fear of a hell which God's decree had made the inevitable doom of a large portion of the human race. Accustomed, as he says, almost constantly in the Sabbath ministrations of Dr. Emmons, to hear that God "had sworn before time was, to get eternal glory out of the eternal torment" of those doomed to wrath, he tells us that at last his whole being rose in hatred against a Being who seemed to him "Infinite Malignity personified." The reaction in his mind, as in so many other active and sensitive minds nurtured in New England during the last two generations, was from higher Calvinism first to Universalism, then to one of the manifold shades of what we call Unitarianism, and at last, when President of Antioch College, he first assumed Church relations, and united with the *Christ*-ians. Having been long recognized as a friend of Parker and Emerson, and a disciple of Comte, it was something of a witticism among his friends that "Mann was called a Christ-ian first at Antioch."

Mr. Mann had firm faith in human progress. The Gospel seems to have been to him, unlike the Pauline formula, the power of truth unto the education of man. Common-school education in America owes far more to him than to any other man. As secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, he gave an impulse to the American common-school system, that is one of the great

forces of modern civilization. When called to this position he saw all the sublime possibilities wrapped up in the office. He entered upon the task bowed down with a sense of its magnitude, yet courageously and indomitably girding himself for the toil. Few, very few men in the land would have seen such grand opportunities for usefulness in this newly-created office, and most would have contented themselves with the performance of an official routine of duties. But as he set himself to prepare his first educational lecture, he writes of the embarrassment that he felt from the "largeness, the infinity of the theme." "It is like an attempt to lift the earth; the arms are too short to get hold of it." Others could not see the subject thus. Even in Massachusetts—now, largely through his efforts, so celebrated for schools—he met with chilling apathy, discouraging words, baffling obstacles flung in his path by men who should have been his warmest friends, and finally a fierce, rancorous opposition. But his faith never faltered; his quenchless enthusiasm burned all the brighter as the waters were poured upon it; it blazed contagious from district to district, fed by his toil, his money, his strength, his health, and almost by life itself. The record of these toils, which made Massachusetts the pioneer of popular education in America, is a stirring story which all should have by heart.

Mr. Mann's years in Congress were those stormy cloud-gathering years whose records are labeled "Fillmore," "Fugitive Slave Law," "New Mexico and California." Staunch and steady he stood, a man of iron, in those days of compromise and political corruption. Hating slavery through every fiber of his soul, he had his weapon drawn whenever and wherever its crest arose.

From Congress he passed to the presidency of Antioch College, in 1853. Here came years of fresh toil, new and more complicated educational campaigns to be fought on untried and unknown ground. The warfare was of a character not wholly to be understood from the pages of this biography; yet, though he fought with his wonted energy and courage, in the midst he fell. The fiery soul consumed the body at last.

It was unfortunate for Mr. Mann, and for the work that he undertook with such noble faith and self-sacrificing zeal, that he could see no middle path between ultra Calvinism and a Naturalism which sadly eclipses, if it does not obliterate, the Supernatural. He believed, or acted as if he believed, that the race is to be saved by works alone. As we read of his wearing, wearying, soul-corroding toil—his longing to live on for ages to toil for humanity—we admire, we love, but long to whisper "CHRIST" into his

car. Faith mingled with his work—faith in the Divine Man—would have mellowed away the asperities of his character that sometimes bruised so sorely his fellow-workers. Comte's "Constitution" usurped in his mind the place left vacant by the Puritan gospel; he had a vivid vision of *Law*, iron and inexorable, crashing through the universe with resistless wheels, and his whole life was one mighty shout to humanity to get out of the Juggernaut's path. We admire the glorious works that his half-faith (faith in man) has given us, but are sad to think what might have been had Law and Gospel dwelt together in his soul. Christ the Exemplar he saw, and pointed his pupils to his footsteps; but Christ the Saviour was veiled by the dreadful shadow that streamed through his life from his childhood. But the veil is lifted now, we hope and believe. N.

---

*Conversion of the Roman Empire.* The Boyle Lectures for the year 1864, delivered at the royal chapel, Whitehall. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D., rector of Lawford, author of the History of the Romans under the Empire. 12mo., pp. 267. New York: Appleton & Co. 1865.

The great reputation which Mr. Merivale has acquired, by his lately published works, as a master of Roman history, will attract profound attention to his tracing the steps by which Christianity gained its ascendancy over the Roman empire, and thence over our civilized world. He opens his work by exhibiting in his first lecture a brilliant contrast between the two most eminent historical points of Pagan despair and Christian exultation. At the height of Roman civilization Julius Cæsar, in the senate house, with the silent concurrence of all the intellect of Rome, pronounced death to be a state of absolute nothingness; three centuries after, at the Council of Nicea, the assembled representatives of the Universal Christian Church, with the emperor Constantine at their head, and the Holy Gospels lying in the midst as an authority superior to all others, constructed a creed for Christendom, embodying terms of most peremptory and emphatic faith in the highest truths of God. By what successive phases did the mind of the world pass from one to the other of these two contrasted conditions? It is a problem of profound interest; and the work of Mr. Merivale is a most interesting development, all too brief, of this great question.

Infidel as classic Paganism was touching immortality and future retribution, Rome still believed in a ruling providence over the state. The gods were gods of Rome, not of the Roman. The state religion assumed a covenant between the city and Jupiter Stator, by which he was to be paid in rites and reverence for his

guardianship over the commonwealth. Personal immortality and personal religion had no existence. The state alone recognized and was recognized by a presiding providence. But even before Christianity took existence, the causes were at work by which this narrow system should be broken up, and the ideas of men become universalized. The philosophy of Plato had asserted the validity of eternal ideas, superior to the conceptions of sense. He had substituted in the place of the old, rude conceptions of Hades and Elysium, imagined by the populace and pictured by poets, which were now repudiated with contempt, those higher and purer intuitions of immortality and retribution which philosophy, in his view, authenticated. But even his immortality was an immortality for the aristocracy of souls; while the destiny of the vulgar and the wicked was—*annihilation!* The conquests of Alexander, meanwhile, followed by the extension of the Roman empire, brought the races and the religions of the East and West, of Asia and Europe, into full communion, when wonderful was the ferment of thought and stupendous the enlargement of views. The unity of the human race became an accepted thought. From the East, where rays of primitive revelation still lingered, came in vaster conceptions of God, a deeper sense of sin, and clearer thoughts of immortality. The utter breaking up of Roman society, the black and hopeless prospects of the political future, flung men's thoughts upon the Infinite. A deep reaction against the brutalizing infidelity of the past rolled in. By the time that the apostles had commenced their world-wide mission, the very philosophers had entirely changed their tone, and men like Plutarch, Dion, Chrysostom, and Seneca, had become moralists and preachers. Great men and families kept their philosophic chaplains to purify their characters, console their moral sorrows, and elevate their religious hopes. And when Christianity was approaching its final triumph, Neo-Platonism organized a rival religion, consisting of a curious compound of Platonic philosophy and Mithraic mythology. Amid this general assemblage of rival faiths, Christianity attained her triumphs by the power of the Holy Spirit upon men's minds, by the wonderful adaptation of her truths to the wants of the human soul, by the intense, positive, and richly-consoling faith which she inspired, and by the singularly holy lives of her devotees, and by the triumphant deaths of her confessors and martyrs.

Such is a very brief and imperfect outline of this brilliant volume. It is a rich study for the Christian scholar. Yet we must express a deep dissatisfaction at the author's stand-point, and the questionable inferences which it seems almost to justify the

rationalist in deducing. He systematically, at start, excludes miracles and prophecy from their proper place; and the consequence is that Christianity appears very much like the mere development of the conceptions of the age. It was simply a crystallization of the best thoughts of the world. Such is the logical result of that self-conceited rejection, so popular at the present day, of the Paleyan proofs of Christianity from miracle, and of Theism by the argument from effect to cause! The question may be properly asked of such emphatic rejectors, Why promote a quarrel between two great classes of proofs of the same great truths? Why make them antagonize rather than co-operate? Why so absurdly imagine that one class must exist only by the destruction of the other? And what aggravates the folly of these rejectors is the plain fact that *Scripture itself does largely and categorically authenticate both the miraculous argument for Christianity and the causal argument for Theism.*

But Merivale's one-sidedness induces him to place the power of Christianity to meet the demands of the soul in a striking light. Merivale's Lectures and Mr. Reid's "Voices of the Soul," are striking counterparts to each other. Reid shows, psychologically, that Christianity meets the wants of the spirit; Merivale shows, historically, that it was by that adaptation to the wants of the spirit that Christianity took possession of the world.

---

*The Life and Character of J. H. Van der Palm, D.D.* By NICHOLAS BEETS, D.D., translated from the Dutch by J. P. WESTERVELT. 8vo., pp. 401. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1865.

The modern literature of Holland is almost a sealed book to the rest of the world. In the days when Latin was the language of scholarly communication throughout Europe, Leyden and Utrecht were oracles, and the names of the great Dutch professors were household words in other countries; but now, as hardly any one out of Holland reads Dutch, men rise to eminence and go to their graves in that good old land, and the rest of mankind are none the wiser for it. The book before us contains the life of a man of note as preacher, politician, orientalist, and professor; yet we honestly confess that his name had never crossed our path till this book was laid before us. We thank Mr. Westervelt with much the same feeling as that with which we lay down a good book of travels in an unknown region.

J. H. Van der Palm, was born in Rotterdam, in 1763, and studied for the ministry at Leyden. The glimpses at social student habits, which this part of the volume affords, are very interesting. We

are told that Van der Palm was noted at the university for "purity of morals," as well as for diligence in study, which one would hardly think of showing with regard to a student in a theological school in this country. At the same time the author tells us (without a word of comment) that he was an assiduous theater-goer, and that he would play cards all the evening, and be quite fresh for his work next day. Another curious illustration: Van der Palm was to defend a thesis in public, on "Ecclesiastes." His friend, Professor Schultens, said to him beforehand, "If it passes off well, you shall have Madeira; if only tolerably, nothing but coffee." After the performance, Schultens was so pleased with his pupil that he "called simultaneously for coffee, Madeira, ratafia, and all kinds of liquor."

Van der Palm was clearly a man of talent, industry, learning, and tact. He succeeded well in his studies, his preaching, and his personal aims. For many years he was the orator, *par excellence*, of Holland; men of all professions acknowledged him as at the head of the art. The mere list of his writings covers four pages of the biography before us; and his literary labors were continued up to within a short time of his death, in 1840. But, as his reputation was almost wholly confined to Holland during his lifetime, so, if his name be long cherished among men, it will be only in Holland. Nothing that he did or wrote seems to have had any influence upon the general movement of Europe, either in religion, literature, or politics. M.

## *Politics, Law, and General Morals.*

*Scripture Testimony Against Intoxicating Wine.* By Rev. William Ritchie, Dunse. 48mo., pp. 75. Glasgow: Scottish Temperance League Office.

Not many months since a noted politician of New York State, in debate with Henry Ward Beecher, used language to the following effect: "You extremists run the temperance cause into the ground; and it is you who by your ultraism are ruining the cause of antislaveryism." In a similar strain it has been said that earnest antislaveryism has been deleterious to religion, drawing the energy of pious men and ministers from the conversion of souls to the emancipation of slaves. What is the true reply to these charges?

While it is true that the so-called "extreme men" are generally efficient workers in the temperance cause, it is not true that the temperance cause has been "run into the ground." The country and the age were truly assailed by two stupendous evils, *slavery* and *intemperance;* but *slavery* pushed the battle so impetuously,

and with such imminent danger of final and complete triumph, that the philanthropists were compelled to concentrate their energies for that battle alone. The antislavery contest absorbed for the time being all the moral strength of the age. By consequence, the temperance effort was remitted; and the Church's labor for immediate conversions was diminished. But the great war of slavery has, thanks be to God, been waged and won, and the Church has leisure to return to her other battle-grounds. Let not our gentlemen bibbers, therefore, lay the flattering unction to their generous souls, that the cause briefly intermitted has been given over or lost. They may yet hear the thunder of the temperance battle disturbing their gratulations over their wine-cups and brandy bottles. God may have gone up for a while, but he is neither dead nor sleeping.

*It is time now for the temperance forces to rouse.* They have work on hand, and room, time, means, and men, for the work. The enemy has, during the intermission, rolled in like a flood. He has triumphed, under the fancy that he was left henceforth to have it all his own way. Availing himself of the demoralization of a great war, strengthened by the example of drunken military generals and corporals, he has swept on as if sure of carrying all before him. As the rebellion, instigated by slavery, has been vanquished, so let this other insurrection against man and against God be laid low. Down with this other fierce "confederacy." Nor would it be amiss if, during our centenary year, a part of our exercises should be devoted to this great reformation. Let our American Methodism commence her new century by placing herself, as in other great and good works so in this, in the forefront of the movement. *Why not have one great simultaneous temperance meeting in all the Churches of American, and, if possible, of European, Methodism?* Is not temperance a part of our religion? part of our Methodism? part of our discipline inserted in our fundamental Rules? We have but to go back in *this* battle, too, to the utterances of Wesley, to find words for our banner, high in the van. And here we have no internal struggle, no "conservative" party enjoining silence, professedly in favor of temperance, yet delicately sensitive to all attacks against drunkenness and rum traffic. Here we have harmony, unity, and, with a little thought and effort, energy. The question is before us as a Church: What can we do to press the temperance reform to success and triumph?

The little Scotch tract which forms the text (or rather, *pretext*) for this notice is a compressed treatment of the Scripture question. It makes out a clear, strong case, vindicating both the Bible and

temperance. It presents an argument worthy the attention of inquirers; and especially of those Churches who would rather not drink poison at the communion table. And when we say that the Church should be a temperance organism, we mean not that she should become a substitute, or an excuse for the non-existence, of special societies; but that she should become the main-spring, motive-power, and director of the whole; taking them as a mighty instrument for good into her own hands, and applying all her force to give them life, activity, and success.

---

*Christianity and Statesmanship.* With Kindred Topics. By WILLIAM HAGUE, D.D., "Author of Home Life," "Guide to Conversation on the New Testament." 12mo., pp. 414. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York, Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati, George S. Blanchard. 1865.

Christianity and the Christian Church have something to do with politics. The Church has a great, direct, authoritative, divine mission in the state, and never must she prove false to her trust. Where politics are indeed but questions of transient and earthly expediency—when they are a contest of mere men or of secular partisanship—the Church has no call to act or speak. But when great ethical questions, deep interests of absolute right or of vital religion, are made to underlie a political platform, the divine reprobation is upon her if she shrink from uttering the eternal truths committed to her trust. Dr. Hague's essays are a happy exhibition of the true spirit of the Christian minister speaking in a wise, liberal, statesmanlike spirit upon the great interests of classes, communities, and nations. They are a beautiful specimen of Christian humanitarianism. Dr. Hague writes in a style somewhat diffuse and over-refined, yet remarkable for clearness, purity, and elegance; often original and eloquent, and very impressive in the entire view he usually presents.

---

## *Periodicals.*

*Southern Christian Advocate.* E. H. MYERS, D.D., Editor. November 9, 1865. Macon, Ga.

The Southern Christian Advocate republishes at full length our editorial in the last Quarterly on "Methodist Churches, North and South." This is in accordance with Dr. Myers' policy, wise and worthy of imitation, of showing by extended extracts from our papers what is the probable temper of our Church. Upon a former article of ours quoted by Dr. Myers through another periodical, he says: "It is refreshing, after what has gone before, to find one Christian sentiment remaining to any of their editors.

We give an article which breathes a better spirit, and to every noble, just, and fraternal sentiment it utters, our own heart responds." Such is this Southern man's spirit. And yet so unaware is our North of the existence of any such susceptibility to kind yet bold utterances, that one of the clearest, noblest minds in our Church, said, upon reading our last article, "You will never awaken a response from those fellows." He held the belief, (but too well justified by the despotic proscriptiveness of the old slave-power,) that the Southern heart was still impervious and the Southern ear still deaf to reason. To him, as to thousands of others, it may be a pleasure to know that our Southern Methodism does respond, sensitively and genially, to generous appeal. And perhaps he may further query whether our enlightened and philanthropic North may not suffer under the influence of ignorance, prejudice, and willful deafness to conviction.

To our Article the Southerner makes the following "response:"

It is the kindest utterance we have yet seen toward any of the Southern Churches; and yet it does gross injustice to Southern Methodism in more than one particular. But such is the general good temper of the article, that we cannot find it in our heart to charge this fact to an evil intention. It is only a further proof that the South is now, as she always has been, misunderstood by Northern men, even by those whose position and general intelligence ought to have made them better acquainted with us. As it is, this article may be counted the expression of those Northern Methodists who entertain the kindest feelings toward us of the Southern Church; and therefore it should be read. It is proper to say, too, that it is from an official editor; and he may, perhaps, rely upon his views being well received by many of his brethren. There is significance, too, in the fact, that Dr. Whedon has always been ranked with the ultra-abolitionists.

Now if any reader will please to glance over our Article, he will perceive that it contains one of the most scathing denunciations of slavery that our "radical" pen ever produced; that it chalks our Southern brethren up to the high mark of suffrage irrespective of color; and that it tells its plain bold truth, not after the manner of blank-cartridge, but in a style that our Southern brother knows to mean every syllable it utters. Yet this article he calmly accepts, and gives us full liberty to thunder antislaveryism and negro suffrage in the very heart of southerndom.* And he does all this, taking care himself to note, as a specially favorable point, that the writer "has always been ranked with the ultra-abolitionists." So that of this "ultra-abolitionist," one of those very "radicals" whom their venerable bishops denounce, he

* Yet a writer in the *Western Christian Advocate* (Rev. G. M. Steele, President of Lawrence University,) says that though we have battled against slavery for years, we "seem to confess that after all there was nothing to fight for!" We never said no such thing, Mr. President. That we have uttered one word to min[illegible] the momentousness of the issue of our great thirty years' war against American

rejoices to pour the utterances into the southern mind. And why has this Southerner thus done? Simply because antislavery and "radical" though we are, he recognizes, intuitively, that ours is a brotherly utterance; that, even in the very points of our abolitionism and our radicalism, our purpose and feeling are to the very bottom so kindly and generous to the South and to Southern Methodism, as perhaps even to raise the query in the Southern mind whether our reasonings and proposals may not be as wise and worthy of consideration as they are friendly.

There are two courses then before us. *One* is, to hate and to denounce, to threaten with "disintegration" and destruction, and to proceed to put your menace into invasive action; the result of all which will be to harden the heart, to deafen the ear, and to drive into antagonism: an antagonism which will solidify them into an indestructible and impervious body, inspired with a traditional fanatical hatred, which may last for ages, against everything Northern. *The other* is, to reveal yourself as a Christian brother, who has no proposal which is not profoundly fair and reasonable, and no purpose which is not for the ultimate common

slavery, is preposterously untrue. We only say, that after the issue is decided it is unnecessary to fight without issue, or at least without any issue that peaceful means may not most effectually decide. It is one thing to say that it is needless to fight after the issue is over, and quite another thing to say the issue was not worth fighting for. The same writer accuses us of a "letting down of old, stern, and lofty principles." Precisely the reverse is the fact. Instead of a "letting down" there is a reining up. Before, we only fought for emancipation, now we contend for enfranchisement. All we are guilty of is so fighting this battle of enfranchisement as to carry its cannonade into the heart of the enemy's territory. And we may here say, the first periodical in the country to advocate, editorially, the doctrine of impartial suffrage was the *Methodist Quarterly Review;* and the first ecclesiastical body to adopt it (in the report of the Committee on Slavery) was the New York East Conference, by a rising and unanimous vote; and both the editorial and the report were written by the same hand. Terrible as has been the contest for freedom and nationality, we hold the results worth all they have cost. And never have we been more earnest than now in the work, or more sanguine in the hope of giving full triumph to the principles of freedom and eternal justice over our nation and over our continent. And one of the best modes by which to attain this, is, we think, the *winning,* if possible, *Southern Methodism to stand by our side in support of these principles.*

There may be strait-lined reasoners who hold it very inconsistent in General Grant, who ten months ago was hurling all the thunders of war upon the South, to be now reducing his army to a peace establishment, and seeking the nation's prosperity through the ways of concord and public economy. He ought to fight on, and fight on, issue or no issue, foe or no foe; otherwise he is confessing that there never was anything worth fighting for, and is letting down his high, stern, etc., etc.!

good. This may melt his hardness; it may cause his soul to flow forth in sympathy; and it is this, if anything, which will win him out of his present narrow-hearted insularity into a broader catholic Christianity, into a full sympathy with the spirit of the age, into the great evangel of freedom, purity, and righteousness.

He has greatly mistaken the nature of *our* individual antislaveryism who supposes that it was ever alloyed with any hatred toward the South. We did hate the slave power and all its abettors, as such; but we loved the South, and sought to emancipate HER from an incubus that was suppressing all her true life. SHE IS EMANCIPATED. And now it is one of the most earnest prayers of our heart to see her taking the straightest and shortest path, in the direction of the purest freedom, to the highest possible prosperity.

We are gratified to note how firmly our positions are sustained by our venerable BISHOPS, who say in their Centenary Address to the Churches:

> May we not at this auspicious period look for a closer union of all who hold our common Methodist faith? We have already, at our meeting at Erie on the 15th of July last, expressed the conviction that "with the removal of slavery the cause which separated us from one another has passed away," and we still trust that the day is not far distant when there shall be but one organization which shall embrace the whole Methodist family in the United States. We would rejoice if in our approaching centenary there could be a general union of all Methodists who agree in doctrine, and who are loyal to the Government and opposed to slavery. It behooves us to cultivate peace and charity toward all men; as followers of Jesus we should do all in our power to soothe the asperities of feeling excited by the war. Let us, as we are exhorted in Scripture, "be tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us."

---

*The Methodist Centenary Almanac for* 1866. 12mo., pp. 72. New York: Carlton & Porter.

*The Methodist Almanac for* 1866. 12mo., pp. 48. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock.

*Two* Methodist Almanacs, we suppose, are among the evidences of our centennial growth. Both are well "got up," containing, besides the usual calendar and programme of state and Church, a due amount of miscellaneous matter. We are gratified, however, to learn, that by a very proper arrangement between the two Concerns, the expense of a double issue will hereafter be avoided.

---

## *Juvenile.*

*Golden-Haired Gertrude:* A Story for Children. By THEODORE TILTON. With Illustrations by H. L. Stephens. 42mo., pp. 40. New York: Tibbals & Whiting. 1865.

*The Fly.* By THEODORE TILTON. New York. Sheldon & Co.

Mr. Tilton here takes a gay trip into the romance-land of the Middle Ages, and imports thence a quaint little tale for our Yan-

kee girldom. His heroine is very much a Cinderella minus the slipper, who captivates the king's son, and is in turn captured as his bride. Every little maiden who reads it will of course become in fancy the king's daughter-in-law; so that doubtless Mr. Tilton will create some twenty thousand little American queens. We would not spoil the tale by disclosing its secret; but girldom does not read our Quarterly.

The Fly is a nursery primer, poetical and pictorial, giving words to the musings of mother and baby over that volatile insect; abounding in terse, vigorous, and sometimes brilliant lines, as

> Spots of red
> Dot his head,
> Rainbows on his wings are spread.

The description of Fly's antipodal feats,

> How he crawls
> Up the walls,
> Yet he never falls,

illustrates the metaphysic in our notice of M'Cosh's Intuitions.

## *Miscellaneous.*

*The Heart and Voice;* or, Songs of Praise for the Sanctuary. Hymn and Tune Book, designed for Congregational Singing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and for Congregations Generally. 8vo., pp. 44. Philadelphia: Perkenpine & Higgins, Lippincott & Co. New York: E. Goodenough. 1865.

*The Elements of Moral Science.* By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D.D. Revised and Improved Edition. 12mo., pp. 396. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard & Co. 1865.

*Richard Cobden.* A Biography. By JOHN M. GILLCHRIST. 24mo., pp. 304. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865.

*Plain Talks on Familiar Subjects.* 12mo., pp. 335. New York: C. Scribner. 1866.

*History of Freidrich the Second,* called Frederick the Great. By THOMAS CARLYLE. In six volumes. Vol. V. 12mo., pp. 515. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865.

EXPLANATION.—The article in our July Quarterly entitled "The Doctrine Concerning God," though containing nothing, as we think, unsusceptible of an orthodox sense, has perhaps some equivocal modes of statement. We will now say that its insertion in the Quarterly is not to be held as entitling it to be quoted as a clear and authoritative exposition of Methodist Trinitarianism.

THE

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## APRIL, 1866.

ART. I.—THE CENTENARY OF AMERICAN METHODISM.

*Journals of the General Conference, held in Philadelphia, May*, 1864. New York: Carlton & Porter.

*Proceedings of the General Centenary Committee, held in Cleveland, Ohio, February* 22, 1865. Published by Authority, etc.

*The Centenary of American Methodism:* A Sketch of its History, Theology, Practical System, and Success. Prepared by order of the Centenary Committee of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. With a Statement of the Plan of the Centenary Celebration of 1866. By JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D. 12mo., pp. 287. New York: Carlton & Porter.

MEASURED by the duration of the mountain, the cedar, the oak, or the rock-pine, a hundred years is but a brief space. Occasionally we find a man or woman whose life has spanned a century, who has seen the hoar-frost of a hundred winters, felt the heat of twice fifty summers, and tasted the autumnal fruits of twenty lustrums. Yet such, though as yesterday compared with nature, or with rock-built piles, are a wonder to us, for they have lived through three full lives, and generations, not monuments, make history.

One of the most numerous of American Churches is just closing its first century, and preparing for a proper commemoration and thanksgiving. Its century has been a remarkable one. Within it was fought the battle for independence which

placed the United States of America on the roll of nations. As its excitements subsided came on the French Revolution, inaugurated with the meeting of the States-General, May 5, 1789, terminating its first stage with the overthrow of the throne and the execution of the king. Its second began with the strife of the Girondists and Jacobins, and advanced through the ghastly scenes of the "reign of terror," closing with the ascendancy of organized military power in 1795. During this was the campaign of 1793, the gallant struggle in La Vendée, the ineffectual effort for Polish independence under Kosciusko, the conquest of Flanders and Holland, and the scientific maneuvers of the campaign of 1795.

The single word NAPOLEON characterizes the next two epochs of that period. The first includes his rise to eminence as the great captain of his age, and terminates with the peace of Amiens. It is like the brilliant stories of fiction to trace the simple facts and names of those few years. There were the Italian campaigns of Napoleon and the German marches of the gallant Archduke Charles. The names of St. Vincent, Camperdown, the Nile, and Egypt suggest wonderful bravery and unsurpassed brilliancy in conducting war. Suwarrow bathed his sword in blood in Italy, Massena won fame amid the fastnesses of the Alps, while Marengo and Hohenlinden are incapable of being forgotten. The Northern coalition was formed, to be melted like snow by the victory of Copenhagen. England was consummating her conquests in India, and establishing there the new empire destined to sway its millions. The triumphant career of the French army was checked and it compelled to retire from Egypt, while in France cruelty and imbecility had prepared the people to welcome the return of their victorious chieftain and invest him with power.

The next was the era of Napoleon the ruler, and France arose to such greatness as to alarm Europe and call for new coalitions. It embraced Austerlitz, Jena, and Friedland; it saw the overthrow of the French naval power by the genius and bravery of NELSON at Trafalgar; "the rise of the desperate struggle in Spain; the gallant though abortive efforts of Austria in 1809; the degradation and extinction of the Papal authority; the slow but steady growth of the English military power in the Peninsula, and the splendid career of Welling-

tion; the general suffering under the despotism of France; the memorable invasion of Russia; the convulsive efforts of Germany in 1813; the last campaign of Napoleon, the capture of Paris, and his final overthrow at Waterloo." *

That, both in Europe and America, was a period of conflict between democratic ideas and old privileges, and the struggle has lasted through the century.

Crowding upon the drama of the French Revolution came other historic events. The Bourbons restored, never forgetting and never learning, are again overthrown, and a Napoleon returns to the throne of the empire. The battles of the Crimea have agitated the world. The "Kingdom of Italy" has changed the political status of that beautiful portion of the earth. England's sway in India has been disturbed by a revolt widespread and dangerous, suppressed at great cost and punished with extreme rigor. Russia has emancipated its serfs. The American Republic has passed through a war for magnitude and expensiveness before unknown, has maintained the unity of its government, vindicated its paramount authority, and closed the struggle by the constitutional emancipation of four millions of slaves.

It has been characterized by remarkable physical progress. The steam-engine, the telegraph, the railway, the photograph, iron-armored ships, throwing projectiles of astounding weight, the power-press, the sewing machine, agricultural machinery, these and other inventions mark the century in which American Methodism has made its history.

It has been an era of intellectual freedom, in which unbelief has been free to assail Christianity to its utmost content. In the morning of the century, Voltaire and his school; since then assaults of all kinds have been made, terminating with the Zulnized arithmetic of Colenso, and the prettinesses of Renan. Hence the century which began with such grand events, and goes to its grave amid the thunders of "Five Forks" and music of breaking chains, has not been one of torpor. Whatever Methodism may have done, has been wrought amid intense excitement and under lynx-eyed observation.

Its completed century dates from a humble service conducted by Philip Embury in the city of New York. It will chant its

* See Preface to Alison's History of Europe; Thiers's Consulate and Empire, etc.

commemoration songs in great states not then surveyed, in cities then and for long after unplanted, and will endow its colleges where then stood the wigwam of the original "native American." It has shared the unexampled physical growth of the country, and much of that it has fostered if not occasioned.

The commemoration of the centenary engaged the attention of the General Conference meeting in Philadelphia in May, 1864. A committee of ministers of learning and experience was appointed. The report fixed October, 1866, as marking the termination of the first century, and set forth the fact that Methodism during that period has exercised a salutary influence upon popular theology, and has been honored with signal usefulness, and therefore it is deemed "right to observe the closing period of this first centenary with special solemnities and pious offerings, which shall present before God some humble expression of our devout gratitude, and lead to a renewed consecration of ourselves, our services, and means to the glory of our divine Master."

Fitly joined to the above were resolutions ordering the public celebration of the occasion with special religious services and devout thank-offerings, commencing on the first Tuesday in October, 1866, and continuing through the month; that "the primary object shall be the spiritual improvement of the membership, especially by reviewing the great things God has wrought for us, the cultivating of feelings of gratitude for the blessings received through the agency of Methodism."

From their importance, as well as for convenience of reference, we reproduce the remaining resolutions:

4. As the gratitude of the heart ever seeks expression in outward acts, we invite as a spontaneous offering to Almighty God on this occasion pecuniary contributions from each "according as God hath prospered him," to be so appropriated as to render more efficient in the century to come those institutions and agencies to which the Church has been so deeply indebted in the century past.

5. Two departments of Christian enterprise shall be placed before our people, one connectional, central, and monumental, the other local and distributive, and all shall be urged to make liberal appropriations to both according to their own discretion.

6. The Board of Bishops shall appoint twelve traveling preachers and twelve laymen, who, in connection with the members of their own Board, shall be a committee to determine to what

objects and in what proportions the moneys raised as connectional funds shall be appropriated, and have power to take all steps necessary to their proper distribution.

7. The local funds shall be appropriated to the cause of education and church extension under the direction, of a committee, consisting of an equal number of ministers and laymen, appointed by the several Annual Conferences within the bounds of which they are raised.

8. Each Annual Conference shall provide for the delivery of a memorial sermon before its own body at the session next preceding the centennial celebration, and also appoint a committee of an equal number of ministers and laymen to give advice and direction for the appropriate celebration of the centennial in our principal churches.

The second step was the appointment of the committee; and the judgment of the bishops represented in it all sections of the country, and the various Church interests, leaving room for the single regret that, from inadvertence, no direct representative of the great German element of American Methodism was selected. The constitution of the committee was approved by the Church as eminently fitting, and there was a general feeling that it was safe to repose with ministers so distinguished, so eminent for learning, so venerable from past service, and so thoroughly versed in the practical details of Methodism, and with laymen of such financial ability, practical sense, and Methodist devotion, the management of the entire interest.

The third stage was the meeting of the General Committee, convened by the bishops in Cleveland, Ohio, February 22, 1865. The venerable senior bishop, T. A. Morris, D.D., was elected president, and Hon. J. M. Bishop vice-president. Rev. J. F. Chalfant, of Ohio, was made secretary. The proceedings were fully reported by the denominational press, and were subsequently published in pamphlet. Thus came the policy of the General Committee before the Church, and was fully discussed, the general tone of sentiment being approbatory.

Before adjourning, a Central Committee, with head-quarters in New York, was appointed, of which Dr. M'Clintock is chairman, and Rev. W. C. Hoyt secretary. Branch committees in the principal cities were appointed at Cleveland, and district committees by the Central Committee, and thus as general and thorough an organization as possible was effected.

The fourth stage in the great movement was the second meeting of the General Committee, held in New York, November 8, in the library of Daniel Drew, Esq. The Bench of Bishops was present, one recently returned from India, and another from the Pacific Coast, from the new conferences organized by the General Conference of 1864, as well as the older portion of the work in California and Oregon. Another was fresh from England and from the missions of Germany and Sweden! "The world is my parish," said John Wesley; and as the writer looked upon that group of men, it did seem as though Wesley's sons were giving proof that the parish should all be cultivated. There was a careful revision of the action at Cleveland, in view of the discussion of the intervening months, the action of annual conferences, etc. Scarcely in the General Conference itself was the whole Church more fully represented. Its findings will engage attention further on.

The committee at Cleveland requested Rev. Abel Stevens, LL.D., to prepare a Centenary volume. He possessed peculiar fitness for the work. For many years he has been the student of ecclesiastical history, and has made Methodist history a specialty. Nearly twenty years ago he produced two volumes entitled "Memorials of Methodism in New England." Later came his "History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism," followed by the "History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America." The preparation of these works had familiarized him with its impelling causes, its early chivalry, its European and American persecutions, and its unparalleled success, and into all these he entered *con amore*. He lived them over, participated in the conflicts, fought over the battles, and exulted in the victories which had been won. Reading those volumes, Methodism is seen to have been the most remarkable ecclesiastical movement of this country. In Great Britain it broke the deadly slumber of the "Establishment," and brought back rectors and congregations to the primitive faith of the New Testament and the personal experience promised believers. In this country it had, on the Atlantic, a hard struggle with rigid ecclesiasticism in order to break its power, intrenched behind barbarous prerogatives. In this struggle it helped to win the good fight of freedom

and equality. It assailed in its strongholds a rigid Necessitarianism, and exploded it, thus aiding intellectual emancipation, and, by developing the idea of personal moral accountability, complementing the Reformation doctrine of the right of private judgment. It shook the domination of the English Establishment, which, refusing adequate provision of ministerial ordination, virtually placed the American Churches under interdict, barring them from the sacraments, from Church-blessed marriage, and compelling them to lay away their dead without the rites of Christian burial. It comprehended in that emergency the doctrine of the Apostolic Church, confirmed by councils and the testimony of the Fathers, that the right of ordination resides with presbyters. At the same time it believed that episcopacy was scriptural and expedient. And thus it established the first, the real, the legitimate Episcopal Church of the United States of America. It gave, by its itinerancy and circuit system, the people a pastorate in rural as well as urban populations. It became the patron of popular education, the founder of schools, the projector of colleges. It established a system of book and periodical publication to this day unequaled. It moved in the advance of the great Sunday-school work, and, by systematic efforts to save the children, gave another proof of being in the valid succession from Him who said "Feed my lambs."

Into all this Dr. Stevens (as he has concisely stated in his dedication to Oliver Hoyt, Esq., his personal friend) entered fully; and, with an admiration sufficiently near hero-worship, he sketches the active lives and abundant labors of the pioneer ministers of the Church.

He divides his work into three parts: "I. What is Methodism? The Question Historically Answered." In this he treats of its origin, founder, and early progress in England, as "a Revival Church in its spirit, a Missionary Church in its organization," "a resuscitation of the spiritual life and practical aims of Christianity." He sketches the two Wesleys and their remarkable mother. We are glad to find reproduced in this popular volume the portion of Luther's Commentary John was reading when his "heart was strangely warmed." Of first historic interest to Methodists, it has heretofore been read by few. The beginning of Methodist preaching, the organization of

societies, the character of persecutions endured, the results attained, the mission to America of Whitefield, the unrivaled preacher, complete the sixty-two pages of chapter first.

American Methodism engrosses the next chapter, its "Origin, Founders, and Progress." The chronology of the author is that adopted by the General Conference. He says: "Though Wesley sent no missionaries to America until 1769, the true epoch of American Methodism dates three years earlier."

It is written, "Despise not the day of small things," and the events recorded in this chapter give emphasis to the charge. In 1758 John Wesley visited county Limerick in Ireland, and found settled in Court Mattress, in Killiheen, Balligarrane, and Pallas, neighboring villages, a strange people. They were neither Celts nor Celtic, but come of the rugged Teutonic stock which dwelt in the Palatinate on the Rhine, from whence they were driven by the papal troops of Louis XIV. These "Palatines" lived alone, orderly and industriously. They spoke the language of their fathers, and with Germanic thrift made the soil teem with vegetation and mottled it with flowers. They were without pastors, but sustained their schools. Mr. Wesley had much success in preaching the Gospel of present, witnessed salvation; but even his almost prophetic ken did not discern that the germ of American Methodism was there and then planted! He did not, even in the visions of his clearest faith, see that "the handful of corn" he there cast into the earth "should shake like Lebanon." This chapter should be read once and again. Eloquently is told the story of the embarkation of the precious freight, the voyage, the landing at New York, and the circumstances under which godly Barbara Heck fairly compelled Philip Embury to proclaim the Gospel which had saved him. The "rigging-loft," and then the chapel on the site of the old John-street Church, became the centers of the "movement." Then came Captain Webb in his royal uniform, to "confirm the faith of the disciples." The preaching captain "traveled at large," carrying Methodism into Long Island and New Jersey; in 1767 or 1768 he organized, in a sail-loft, the first class in Philadelphia; and in 1770 secured the purchase of St. George's Church. In 1769 he planted the cause in Delaware. Visiting Baltimore, he comprehended the necessity of more laborers for the whitening harvest, and first

wrote and then went to Mr. Wesley, and returned in 1773, bringing with him Rankin and Shadford. Embury continued the laborious, unsalaried pastor of John-street until the arrival of the "assistants" in 1769.

There was a fire burning toward the one kindled in New York. Another Irishman, Robert Strawbridge, was busy in Maryland. Some time between 1760–1765 he went to reside on Sam's Creek, in Frederick County, and after using his own cabin as a chapel, he secured the erection of a rude log building twenty-two feet square. It was never completed, but beneath its primitive pulpit the brave Strawbridge buried two of his children. Restless, though "resigned," he traversed the country as a flame of fire. Methodism was soon rooted in Baltimore, which for many years was a great denominational center. In the good days of peace and freedom may it become so once again! We urge the reading of this chapter until it is written upon the memory.

Reluctantly we pass the brilliant record of early Methodist evangelists presented in the succeeding chapter. Next is traced the rapid growth of Methodism, stretching westward, southward, and northward, crystalizing in the formation of Annual and General Conferences, the first of which convened in Philadelphia in 1773 with ten preachers, who reported one thousand one hundred and sixty members. The first General Conference gathered in Baltimore in 1784 for the formal organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Thus, with its well-compacted system of government, its articles, its liturgy, its hymnology, with the first Protestant bishops of the Western hemisphere, Methodism entered upon its second stage of American development. The statistical facts of this chapter are of much value to those designing either to write or speak on the topics of the Centenary Year.

The fifth chapter sketches the "Practical System" of Methodism. It is matter of regret that the peculiarities of our system are so seldom presented to our people by their pastors, and that so many communicants are in ignorance of its checks and balances, of its remarkable adaptation, of its popular character, and the yet latent elements of its efficiency. In this chapter is a fine *résumé*, which may be studied with much profit. In the succeeding chapter the "Doctrinal System" which has

been the staple of Methodist preaching, is considered. It is matter for thankfulness that in the various separations which have occurred, there has been none caused by contrary theological views, and the healthy Arminianism of Wesley and Fletcher is held, for "substance of doctrine," by all branches of Methodism. Our author says Wesley's

> Arminianism was far from being that mongrel system of semi-Pelagianism and semi-Socinianism which for generations was denounced by New England theologians as Arminianism, until the most erudite Calvinistic authority of the Eastern States, (Professor Stuart of Andover) rebuked the baseless charge, and bade his brethren no longer be guilty of it. Wesley taught *original sin* in the language of the ninth Anglican Article; though he taught also that both the justice and mercy of the Creator require that the human race should not have been continued, under this law of hereditary depravation, unless adequate provision were made for it by the atonement; he preached, therefore, universal redemption.—Page 127.

It is well that the occasion comes for presenting anew the symmetrical harmonious type of Wesleyan Arminianism. It recognizes divine sovereignty, it recognizes human freedom, and teaches

> That the salvation or non-salvation of each human being depends on his own free action in respect to the enlightening, renewing, and sanctifying inworkings of the Holy Spirit. If, in respect to these inworkings, he hold himself receptively, then will he become holy both here and hereafter; but if he closes his heart against the same, he will continue in death both here and in eternity. With this ground-view, all the other peculiarities of Methodism, such as its peculiar dogma of freedom, its emphasis of the working of the Holy Spirit, its doctrines of Christian perfection, etc., are intimately connected. In respect to its inmost spirit and essence it is a viewing of Christianity from the stand-point of Christian perfection or perfect love.
>
> Such is the stand-point, such the doctrinal and historical significance, of the Methodistic system. It presents Christian theology "high as the love of God, deep as the want of man." It is the ripe final result of the millennial-long spiritual study and searching of the Church of Christ into the truths of the divine revelation. And as soon as this view of the soteriological relation of God and man shall find universal prevalence and acceptance, so soon will the salvation or non-salvation of the soul cease to be made dependent either on human conduct in regard to a particular priesthood or an eternal decree of God, or on the mysterious working of Church ceremonies, but will be regarded as depending

on man's own action in regard to the enlightening, renewing, and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. Let us venture to hope for an early dawn of that day, so much anticipated and so anxiously wished for by so many and such earnest spirits of our time, in which a new and rich outgushing of the Holy Ghost will put an end to the intolerable disagreements of the old Churches and creeds, and reveal the kingdom of God in power and great majesty.

Part Second presents an answer to the question, "*What has Methodism achieved entitling it to the proposed commemoration?*" Not to boast, or to stretch ourselves beyond our measure, but in simple justice to our fathers and brethren, do we say that it is time to answer this question. Among public men and in sister Churches there is an amount of ignorance, real or affected, for which there is no apology. Nay, during this era of fraternization and good feeling it has become too much the style to keep them out of sight, in our own pulpits, from our own children. Time, that proves all things, has been busy with Methodism for a century. Is it a success or a failure? If successful, has its strength been spiritual or worldly? What fruit has it borne? Let the facts be arrayed; let the scroll of history be unrolled. Thankful are we that this grand epoch furnishes the occasion. The author treats its Special Adaptation and Usefulness to the Country; its Labors in the Diffusion of Literature; its Sunday-School Enterprises; its Loyal and Patriotic Services; and closes with an interesting Summary Review. We venture these, and other facts to be brought out during the centenary year, will come to not a few Methodists with the freshness of a new revelation.

The chapter on the Loyalty and Patriotic Services of Methodism claims brief but honorable mention. It shows the real position of our Church during the Revolution. Our English ministers, like those of other denominations, mostly returned to England. Mr. Wesley sought to prevent war and, what he saw would follow, separation and independence, hence he wrote his "Calm Address to the American Colonies." England was mad, and with cruelly systematic madness compelled war, and was beaten. Then he demanded justice for the colonists. We cut from the volume before us an extract from his letter to Lord North and the Earl of Dartmouth, written the day after receiving the news of Lexington and Concord:

I am a High-Churchman, the son of a High-Churchman, bred up from my childhood in the highest notions of passive obedience and non-resistance, and yet, in spite of all my long-rooted prejudices, I *cannot avoid thinking these, an oppressed people, asked for nothing more than their legal rights, and that in the most modest and inoffensive manner that the nature of the thing would allow.* But waiving this, I ask, Is it common sense to use force toward the Americans? Whatever has been affirmed, these men will not be frightened, and they will not be conquered easily. Some of our valiant officers say that "two thousand men will clear America of these rebels." *No, nor twenty thousand, be they rebels or not, nor perhaps treble that number.* They are strong; they are valiant; they are one and all enthusiasts, enthusiasts for liberty, calm, deliberate enthusiasts. In a short time they will understand discipline as well as their assailants. But you are informed "they are divided among themselves." So was poor Rehoboam informed concerning the ten tribes; so was Philip informed concerning the people of the Netherlands. No; they are terribly united; they think they are contending for their wives, children, and liberty. Their supplies are at hand, ours are three thousand miles off. Are we able to conquer the Americans suppose they are left to themselves? We are not sure of this, nor are we sure that all our neighbors will stand stock still.

Bishop Asbury's British birth caused him to be suspected, but he was the staunch friend of independence. Dr. Stevens gives an interesting statement, well worthy insertion did our space permit, which shows how our young Church, with the clear vision of spiritual patriotism, saw the danger of state-rights heresies, and in its creed, among its Articles of Faith, wrote the majestic authority of the new nation.

Not alone to the Revolution does our Church make its appeal for full proof of its loyalty and patriotic devotion. Its centenary year presses hard upon the stupendous war for the Union, for the doctrine of its creed, the record of its pulpit and press, the patriotic devotion of its sons—all this is passing into history. What the late President said in answer to the deputation of the General Conference—and the words were spoken while the terrible battles of the Wilderness were being fought—is known. It is not well that this page of our Church history should either be torn out or folded down.

He retraces the well-known genesis of American Methodism, and want of space alone prevents our dwelling upon this part, and obliges us to hasten to those parts in which he furnishes new topics, and traces fresh lines of thought.

From the Past and its Achievements, the author passes to consider the "Capabilities and Responsibilities [of Methodism] *for the Future*."

The author's finding is, that to-day it stands strong, with its solid scriptural theology, its system compact and vigorous, and "with more diffused wealth than any sister denomination." If this be so, it should ask solemnly what are its responsibilities? The author classifies them thus: First, the better consecration of its wealth to the public good. The population of the country is increasing with unequaled rapidity, and the country is daily growing richer. All is active. The Church is summoned to such high duties as never before demanded her activities. As one of the first duties is the "more vigorous prosecution of its educational work, and that it shall crown its present jubilee by endowing, in accordance with the plan of its Centenary Committee, a monumental fund for education which shall worthily commemorate the great occasion." Secondly, "It should especially enlarge its means of ministerial education." Thirdly, "Methodism should feel itself responsible to minister hereafter, more than heretofore, to the public culture by the improvement of church architecture." He files a special plea for "religious art," which, "unlike painting and sculpture, [he might have added music,] will not lend itself to vice; its severe and stately beauty disdains effeminate or voluptuous tastes. It is the most sublime, the most religious of the works of art." He pleads for it, further on, on the score of economy, and the point is well taken. Deformity in church building is frightfully expensive.

In this plea for "religious art," let it be understood that building committees are henceforth expected to provide for all the peculiarities of Methodism. The elevation may be perfect Gothic, Byzantine, Norman, or Romanesque; but if there are no accommodations for the Sunday-school, the prayer and class-meeting, the edifice is a costly failure. Give it these, provide the best possible conveniences for preaching, for the administration of the sacraments, for sacred song, and let it have an exterior of churchly beauty which shall not require a sign-board to distinguish it from a boarding-house or factory.

Fourthly, "It should be one of its most earnest aims to consolidate its forces by the union of its American branches."

The author sees no reason for the continued separation of the Southern from the Methodist Episcopal Church. Slavery, the "middle wall," is broken down; one in doctrine, one in economy, and substantially one in discipline, there should be an early union. Time will show. Such a consummation cannot be hurried. But surely the other branches of Methodism cannot see cause for further division. Are we not one in the glorious memories of our heroic past? Are we not one in our Bible Arminianism? Have we not one grand aim? Let the richly-colored leaves of October, our grand centennial month, fall upon the grave of our divisions!

We commend the discussion of his fifth topic to our ministry and Church officers: "Methodism should earnestly seek to solve that now most important of its practical problems, how to secure its children in its own pale."

The last topic is thus stated: "Finally, and above all things, Methodism is reminded of its responsibility to maintain vital apostolic piety in the land, and to spread it over the world."

For Methodism to ignore the supernatural, and no longer to rely upon divine energy, is to be Methodism no more. It must not be borne away by fanaticism, neither must it be water-logged by formalism. Eminently, truly *churchly*, let it not strike the guidons of its battle-marchings to a cold *churchism*. Its vocation is to spread a revival of God's work until the world is saved. Let it bestir itself, for other denominations are striving mightily for the salvation of the lost, and Methodism should hear that apocalyptic voice: "Let none take thy crown." In this regard special obligation rests upon the strong and wealthy Churches of our cities. They give tone to others. Let them show by their intensified earnestness that all is consecrated upon the altar of Christian service.

The chapters thus noticed have all the peculiarities of the author. Full of life, sparkling, burning, energizing the reader with the same animus. We smile to meet the familiar "in fine" and "upshot," almost as inseparable from the doctor's style as the meerschaum from the study of the German.

To his chapters Dr. M'Clintock has added a valuable supplement. Without a detailed statement of the exact condition of the centennial celebration, the volume would be a disappointment. This Dr. M'Clintock has given clearly and concisely,

in a "Statement of the Connectional Arrangements for the Celebration of the Centenary of American Methodism, 1866, as authorized by the General Conference and the Committees appointed by its Order." As chairman of the Central Committee, the doctor is familiar with the whole subject. This appendix gives the action of the General Conference, of the General Committee, names of the members of the committees, etc. It will be observed the grand design of the pecuniary side of the celebration is educational. To the relief and endowment of colleges and academies most of the local funds will be appropriated. In the connectional funds there will be two exceptions: the Centenary Mission Buildings in New York, and the Irish Connectional Fund. The first appeals to the whole Church. There is at present no suitable mission hall in New York, no place worthy the dignity of the annual meetings, no proper museum for missionary curiosities, nor suitable accommodations for missionaries who, with their families, await transportation. The Irish Fund rests on other grounds. The past tells how much American Methodism has received from Ireland—Barbara Heck, Embury, Strawbridge. Irish Methodism is in the forefront of the contest with popery, and yet loses annually by emigration to America more than its aggregate increase of membership. There are more Irish Methodists in America than in Ireland.

Prominent among connectional objects is the cause of ministerial education; and it is remarkable that this is the first call made upon the whole Church by its chief authorities for this purpose. The statement will excite surprise; let its significance be pondered. Appeals have been made for colleges, academies, and seminaries, but none for ministerial education distinctively. Its two biblical schools were planted, the one in New England, by New England contributions, the other in the Northwest, by the beneficence of that elect lady, Mrs. Garrett; and in the centennial year the third starts into life from the princely liberality of DANIEL DREW. Thus it appears they have cost the Church literally nothing.

*Per contra*, there is a loud and persistent demand from the Churches for a ministry of culture. Now let our laymen know distinctly that the bishops appoint the pastors from the men selected *by* the laity, *from* the laity. Such as they furnish,

and no others, can be sent. They can have such as they are willing to provide, and can have no others. For the first time there is a connectional call made by authority, and the response of the brethren who so loudly demand the "ministry of culture" is to be seen. For the first time the laymen of the Church are to go upon the record on this question. With full faith we await the result.

The wisdom of the Church is accepting as sufficient for its present wants, and perhaps for years to come, those now in operation with the one proposed by the munificence of Mr. Drew, and recognized by the General Committee. The General Conference has advised against their rapid multiplication, and with good reason. Each of these schools can be made, by wise liberality, to furnish instruction to as many students as throng the halls of any of the higher collegiate institutions. Those at present established are accessible to young men from all parts of the Church. Prudence demands that they be amply endowed, and made competent to the instruction of all comers. To make them second to none, these institutes demand the concentrated patronage of the Church. Their chairs should be filled by its most competent men, and when filled given so large a number of students as to inspire them with enthusiasm. The buildings should be spacious, and adapted to every want. The libraries should include all that is valuable in the theological lore of the past and present. These essentials can be secured only by concentration. In due time one must be planted upon the Pacific, and possibly others may be needed; but at present let the Church make the existing trio worthy of the connectional liberality of Methodism.

Dr. M'Clintock pertinently sets forth the claims of the Biblical School in *Bremen* in paragraphs below:

The *Biblical School at Bremen* affords instruction to young men preparing for the ministry in Germany, as well as in America. Its support appeals to no single locality of Methodism, but to the whole Church. Let us remember that the Palatine Irish, among whom Embury and his associates were trained, were not Romanists, but the children of German Protestants. Let us remember, too, that our Methodist theology, and especially our Methodist view of practical and experimental religion, were originally derived by Wesley from German sources. It was the reading of Luther

to Galatians that led Wesley to true faith in Christ. It was the influence of the suggestions of Bohler and the Moravians that gave his mind the first bias toward the full evangelical view of faith and its effects. (See pp. 29–32.) And with this sense of gratitude for the past, let us consult our security for the future by doing all we can to evangelize, *in their own home*, the Germans who are to make up so large a part of the future American people.—Pp. 261, 262.

Thus far in these educational centenary movements there are local interests commending them especially to the favor of some portions of the Church. But what shall be the commemorative educational monument of the centennial? Not a gigantic university, as some have suggested. It is useless to argue for the impossible. It is easy to paint such a central university, equal to Yale and Harvard, and it appeals strongly to denominational pride; but such a project would not command the support of New England, committed to the Wesleyan at Middletown; it would excite the opposition of the friends of Ohio Wesleyan, Asbury, Northwestern, etc. It is a fine picture, and only a picture. It is equally impossible to concentrate the benevolence of the whole Church upon either of the biblical schools, or upon a new one, which should be the colossal center, of which the Boston and Evanston schools should be modest, unpretentious wings. Still more visionary is the proposition to make the erection of a gigantic Book Concern and Mission House in New York the connectional monument of the centennial. There is a Western Book Concern, which will never consent to be thus overshadowed and "made of none effect." It is to be regretted that a scheme so impracticable has been thrown upon public attention at so late an hour.

The centenary monument is not to be a massive pile of marble; not a sculptured obelisk, not a cloud-piercing spire, but an institution, a great connectional fund, consecrated for all time to the work of Christian education. Into this we trust every contributor will direct a portion of his gifts. Dr. Stevens this mouument as to be,

> Witnessed by the eyes of our posterity, when on the anniversary morning of October, 1966, they shall throng in redoubled hosts to their temples, and respond back over our graves to this anniversary epoch, and send forward to the next the anthems of our jubilee. God grant that the hymns of that

morning may resound not only over this, but over both American continents, from Labrador to Terra del Fuego, and that the missions of Methodism may respond to them from all the ends of the earth! Our chief memorial of the epoch, as has been stated, is not to be a building but an institution—a Fund for Education; the interest of which alone is to be expended, the principal to be handed down as our salutation to the Methodists who shall assemble on that far-off morning. A more practicable or more sublime design is hardly possible to the denomination. Its other leading interests, like missions, Sunday-schools, etc., have the habitual sympathy and support of its people, but education can hardly expect such support, and yet can it be pronounced a less important, though it may be a less direct, interest of the Church? Were its centenary contributions to be given to these more immediate interests, they would soon be absorbed or expended, profitably indeed, but in such manner as to lose their monumental character. The Church can confide these interests to its current sympathy and help, but education needs permanent endowment, and a great educational fund, like that proposed, is of all Church interests the best fitted to be monumental. It can continually assist our existing seminaries and erect new ones, and yet its undiminished principal be transmitted as our benediction to the future. Let us then establish it on a scale worthy not only of the last, but of the next hundred years of our history.—Pp. 242, 243.

Dr. M'Clintock thus rouses the attention of the Church:

It is the *one* object to which every member of the Church, it is hoped, will contribute something, inasmuch as it is, of all the objects named, the most thoroughly Connectional and the most clearly monumental. A permanent fund of a million of dollars, or more, will be a monumental institution, more lasting than brass, to carry down to posterity the gratitude of the Methodists of 1866, as testified by their Centenary gifts. It will form at the same time our most beneficent legacy of the Centenary year to the century that is to follow. The rapid march of the census of American population outstrips all calculation. By the year 1900 there will be teeming millions in regions now just opened to settlement and to enterprise. Moreover, the whole South is just reopened by the extinction of the great rebellion. For all this vast population our Permanent Fund will afford a steady assistance and stimulus to effort for the great work of Christian education. Let us make this fund a grand and worthy Centenary monument. If there be failure in any part of our plan, let there be none in this.—P. 259.

We see in this a strong connectional bond, fastening the extremes to the center. If we shall found a benefaction for the generations coming after us, a benefaction which cannot be wielded with sectional partiality, will they, for any trivial

cause, cut loose from it? It is wise to strengthen the centripetal force of our Church where that will dispense centrifugal beneficence. We trust the good sense of our people will suffer nothing to defeat this connectional movement. At the risk of incurring the charge of tautology we repeat, *Let every donor direct into this fund a portion of his gifts.* Let the rich cast into this treasury of their abundance, let the widow give it one of her two mites, and the poor dispense it a portion from their poverty. It will be short-sighted policy which shall refuse aid to this fund to concentrate upon local objects. Especially let the above sentence be pondered by the newer portions of our connection. They may concentrate all in their immediate circle upon local objects, but to do so will contract the liberality of donors, lessen the grand churchly character of the movement, and becloud a brilliant future for a half successful present. *Something from every Methodist for the Centenary Educational Fund!* Let that be everywhere spoken, whispered, shouted! Let it ring from every Methodist pulpit, and be *Advocated* by the entire *Methodist* press! The Church will do right if it has the information.

The *Central Committee* takes it for granted that the conference committees and special agents will take care of the local causes, and puts forth its efforts for the general. It appoints branch and district committees to supervise the general interests, receive and forward connectional funds, etc. The pastors are representatives of the authority of the General Conference when they represent those funds.

There is no conflict between the connectional and local. They supplement, not antagonize each other. There is care for neighborhood and conference interests while there is hearty hand-shaking with the whole Church. Let there be the utmost care in avoiding all collision and in securing all harmony.

It was a grave inadvertence which caused some conferences to assume the dictation of the disposition of local funds. The General Conference guarded that carefully, so that the laymen, from whom the large percentage of contributions must come, shall be as potential in their distribution as the ministry. Many of the conferences acted in advance of the last meeting of the General Committee, and so in ignorance of the facts. The

responsibility is with the mixed committees, and the conference action can only be regarded as advisory.

Dr. M'Clintock has collated information as to the manner of the collections, and we commend the sections found between pages 260 and 269 to the careful consideration of committees and pastors.

And now the great occasion is upon us. Not in strife or vainglory let the whole army of Methodism in all its divisions move to its observance. It ought to bind anew the cords of connectional sympathy and love. In the preparation for our denominational jubilee, let us not be men of a section, but of the Church. Let us walk about our Zion, count *all* its towers, and tell *all* its bulwarks. Minnesota shall send greeting to Mississippi, Maine to California, Vermont to Oregon! The centennial song of the Atlantic shall be sung to the accompaniment of the Pacific. O that in sacred oneness, the oneness of doctrine symboled by that glorious utterance, GOD IS LOVE, all the children born to Methodism may meet at their thanksgiving festival! There have been strifes and divisions; there have been dissensions and separations—alas that it has been so! Now, in the name of our Master, who said, "I pray . . . that they may all be one,"

"Let the dead past bury its dead,"

and let us again strike fraternal hands, and, by-gone divisions forgotten, let the whole household sing,

"Servants of one common Lord,
Sweetly of one heart and mind,
Who can break a threefold cord,
Or part whom God hath joined?

"Partakers of the Saviour's grace,
The same in mind and heart,
Nor joy, nor grief, nor time, nor place,
Nor life, nor death can part."

Let the whole family of Methodism aspire after such a spiritual baptism as shall make its centennial never to be forgotten. As our pulpit and press shall review the doctrinal system which hath wrought so mightily, shall there not be also proclaimed in stirring appeals the privilege of all to enjoy that depth of Christian experience, that partnership of Christian power, which made our fathers invincible?

We reproduce, as pertinent to this line of thought, one or two paragraphs from the eloquent address of the deceased Mr. Thornton to the last General Conference:

The great matter is, we need the baptism of the Holy Ghost. How often have we said, in the language of the Nicene divines, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son." How often have we protested that our services without Him are clouds without water, clouds which (as Richard Watson said) may be gay with all the hues of light, but which mock the husbandman as they pass in brilliant career over his parched fields. The clouds we long to see are charged with the vapors of spring, tremble to the impulse of the breeze, and impatient to pour the vital shower on the dry and thirsty earth. We want the Holy Ghost.

We want the constant baptism, not merely a fruitful rain here, and sterility there and then; not excitement to-day and miserable coldness to-morrow; but zeal fed from the celestial altar, a fire that will not go out. We want a constant revival, one continual ingathering of souls. Then he that reapeth shall receive wages, and gather fruit to life everlasting. But while we desire a constant baptism of grace, we value the extraordinary effusions also, when God shall send them, and when the living waters cut their own channels. Then all hail to the life-giving floods! May they come on Europe and on America! "Awake, awake, O north wind, and blow! thou south wind, awake! Then shall the spices of the garden of the Lord flow out, and Zion will be the joy of the earth." Had I the voice of thunder, I would lift it up in affirming that what the Church wants more than everything else is the power from on high, the glory of the Holy Ghost, the pentecostal flame. Pentecost is not an obsolete word. It does not belong to old history only. The Spirit is coming.

*What ought the Church to do as a thank-offering in the consecration of her substance to the Lord?* Let it be first of all remembered that this offering is in addition to the regular collections, not substituted for either of them. They must be honestly and faithfully presented and the usual response given. Then, after they are provided for, is to come the thank-offering of the century.

How much shall it be? The General Conference said:

As the highest authority of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we commend this whole subject to the prayerful consideration of every minister, traveling and local, and every official and private member of the Church, calling for the most systematic and energetic efforts everywhere to carry out in their true spirit these noble plans; and after due consideration, we deem it right to ask for

and to expect not less than two millions of dollars for achievements which will be worthy of our great and honored Church, and which shall show to our descendants to the latest generations the gratitude we feel for the wonderful Providence which originated and has so largely blessed and prospered our beloved Church.

"Not less than two millions"—that sum is the minimum. Our personal views of the ability of the Church might be deemed extravagant. We give, instead, the sober estimate of Bishop Morris, the venerable senior of the Episcopal college. He has seen the Church growing. Fifty years has he spent in its ministry, and during that time he has traversed its length and breadth. In a recent communication to one of the Church papers he said:

The figures below have reference to the final aggregate of centenary contributions to both funds, connectional and local. Our communicants, omitting small fractions, are 929,000. These I divide into sections of 100,000 each, and note down what those of each section can probably give, on an average, per member, proceeding upon the Bible scale, "from the least to the greatest," or from the poorest to the most wealthy. The estimate is moderate. If there be any failure in filling the bill it will not be for want of will or ability on the part of our people, but because of neglect on the part of pastors to secure universal attention of all our friends in all the charges to this glorious enterprise.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. 100,000, average 25 cents | $25,000 |
| 2. 100,000, average 50 cents | 50,000 |
| 3. 100,000, average 75 cents | 75,000 |
| 4. 100,000, average $1 | 100,000 |
| 5. 100,000, average $2 | 200,000 |
| 6. 100,000, average $3 | 300,000 |
| 7. 100,000, average $5 | 500,000 |
| 8. 100,000, average $10 | 1,000,000 |
| 9. 100,000, average $20 | 2,000,000 |
| Fraction of 29,000, good for | 750,000 |
| Total | $5,000,000 |

So far as I can understand the matter, there is nothing impracticable or extravagant in this estimate of $5,000,000. If we realize that sum in 1866, and secure a net increase of seventy-one thousand members to make up an even million, I shall be content.

Who can pronounce his estimate extravagant? Is there *one* of his specifications which a thoroughly organized effort cannot accomplish? If not, and if there are those who purpose princely offerings, why may we not confidently expect the five millions which the practical bishop pronounces a moderate estimate? It is within the easy reach of the Church.

But the time for argument is passed by and the time for action comes. It is doubted if 1966 will bring so glorious an opportunity. Methodism comes now with a nation's blessing upon her head, amid the thanksgivings of peace, and the grateful shouts of four millions of liberated sons of bondage; comes after a century of unexampled progress and of unmeasured prosperity to answer the question of her own heart:

"What shall I render unto the LORD for all his benefits toward me?"

History shall record in what manner the question was answered.

---

## ART. II.—THE LATEST ATTEMPTS TO HARMONIZE THE MOSAIC HISTORY OF CREATION AND GEOLOGY.

GIOVANNI BATT. PIANCIANI, (S. J.) *Cosmogonia naturale comparata col Genesi.* Roma: 1865.

J. H. KURZ, *Bibel und Astronomie nebst Zugaben verwandten Inhalts.* Eine Darstellung der Biblischen Kosmologie und ihrer Beziehungen zu den Naturwissenschaften. Fünfte Auflage. Berlin: 1864.

ATHANASIUS BOSIZIO, (S. J.,) *Hexaëmeron und die Geologie.* Briefe über die Anwendung der geologischen Forschungen bei der Auslegung der heiligen Schöpfungsgeschichte. Mainz: 1865.

F. W. SCHULTZ, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte nach Naturwissenschaft und Bibel.* Beitrag zur Verständigung. Gotha: 1865.

THE apologetical exposition of the first chapter of Genesis, or, in other words, the establishment of a harmony between Bib-

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.—The article here presented in an English dress appears in the first number of a new German monthly entitled "*Der Beweis des Glaubens.*" As its title indicates, the new periodical is devoted to the defense of Christianity, particularly against *naturalistic science, pantheistic philosophy,* and *ultramontane proselytism.* It enrolls very strong men in its list of editorial and other contributors, and, judging from the first two numbers, promises to become one of the most wide-awake and valuable of the periodicals of Germany. We take pleasure in recommending it—without solicitation—to all readers of German interested in the discussion of apologetical questions. It may be ordered through any German bookseller, the subscription price being for the present 1½ thaler, Prussian currency, with a prospect of reduction as soon as the enterprise shall have become financially paying. Each number contains 48 pages.

lical Revelation and Geological Science in the realm of Cosmogony, is one of the most interesting and at the same time one of the most difficult problems in the entire domain of Christian Apology. The manifestly not inconsiderable difference which exists between the succession of creative acts in the Hexaëmeron and the succession of geological formations, together with their organic remains, has called forth in the progress of modern geological and palæontological research a whole series of attempts at reconciliation, the latest of which are especially marked by learned ingenuity, and by the greatest possible avoidance of that harshness and capriciousness of exegesis which not unfrequently characterized former works. There are particularly four ways in which the reconciliation of these differences has been attempted: 1. By running a strict parallel between the six days of creation and the main epochs of the geological development, (hypothesis of *Literal Agreement.*) 2. By making the geological epochs and catastrophes anterior to the six days of creation, (the *Restitutionary Hypothesis.*) 3. By referring the palæontological phenomena to geological revolutions and cataclysms posterior to the Hexaëmeron, particularly to the universal deluge described in Genesis vi–ix, (the *Diluvian Hypothesis.*) 4. By abandoning the effort to establish a *strict* agreement between Geology and Genesis, in consequence of apprehending the Mosaic account of creation as indeed true, but not literally and scientifically accurate, (hypothesis of *Ideal* or *Substantial Agreement.*)*

In the following pages we will subject each of the above-mentioned methods of reconciliation to a careful examination, glancing occasionally at that which has thus far been done toward their scientific elaboration and proof, but preserving a special reference to the four new works mentioned at the head of this article, each one of which advocates one of the above hypotheses with warmth and decision.

I. The most natural attempt to explain the origin of the geological formations, and of the petrifactions contained in them, was, for the simple Scripture faith of the elder theologians, the

* The first of these hypotheses is styled by our author "*Die Concordanz hypothese*" the last "*Die Ideal-concordistische Hypothese.*"—*Tr.*

supposition that these organic remains date from the *Noachian deluge*, or if not exclusively from this, at least from similar desolating catastrophes *subsequent* to the Hexaëmeron. Already the Church Father *Tertullian* attributed diluvian origin to the petrified shells and animals which are found in and on the mountains.* At the end of the seventeenth century *Leibnitz* pursued (in his "*Protogæa*") essentially the same course for the genetic explanation of the new facts which geology already in his day was rapidly bringing to light. In his footsteps followed the Englishmen *Thomas Burnet*, (Telluris Theoria Sacra, 1698;) *John Woodward*, (an Essay toward a Natural History of the Earth, 1696, 1733;) and others, as also the celebrated Zurich naturalist and physician *Scheuchzer*, who believed to have found in the anthropomorphous skeleton of a gigantic salamander the bones of a human being who had perished in the deluge, and accordingly a strong proof for the truth of Bible History, (*Homo diluvii testis; Herbarium diluvianum; Physica sacra*, 1727, ss.) More recently the Russian geologist Stephan Kutorga, ("Einige Worte gegen die Theorie der stufenweise Entwickelung der organischen Wesen der Erde," 1839,) the Frenchman Sorignet, ("La Cosmogonie de la Bible devant les Sciences Perfectionnées," 1854;) the well-known Lutheran theologian and Old Testament commentator, Keil, (in Dieckhoff and Kliefoth's "Zeitschrift," 1860, p. 479, ss.; as also in his "Commentary on Genesis," 1862;) and latest of all the distinguished Roman Catholic preacher and devotional author, E. Veith, (in his Apologetical Lectures on Genesis i–xi, delivered in Vienna, "Die Anfänge der Menschenwelt," 1865,) have attempted to defend, in substance, this diluvian hypothesis. Among the authors of the four works here to be reviewed, the Jesuit Bosizio also declares himself in favor of this method of reconciliation.

At the very beginning of his work, our author emphasizes the great uncertainty, vacillation, and disagreement of the current geological investigations and opinions, and argues therefrom, that it is the duty of the defender of Genesis to proceed with the greatest caution. He thence proceeds to subject the attempts thus far made to reconcile Genesis and Geology (that is, the main forms of the first two hypotheses

* *Tertullian*, de Pallio, chap. ii. Compare also *Hippolytus*, Refutat. haeres, I, 14.

above enumerated) to a searching criticism, and then seeks to show that the geogenic theories of modern geology are wholly unreliable. How little one can trust to these theories is seen, he says, 1, From the fact that, as yet, only an extremely thin stratum of the earth has been scientifically investigated, and that one can as little pretend to a correct knowledge of the interior of our planet as a man who has made scratches here and there in the skin of his hand can pretend to the possession of an exact anatomical knowledge of his whole body, (p. 227;) 2. From the fact that the millions of years which the geologists require for the formation of the sedimentary rocks have been deduced solely from hypotheses of the most baseless and, in part, most contradictory character, (p. 236;) 3. From the observations of such physicists as Ehrenberg, V. Leonhard, Göppert, and Daubrée, who, especially the two latter, have demonstrated by reliable experiments that the formation of the crystalline rocks, and their petrifactions under other conditions of air and heat, not only *could*, but also *must* have proceeded much more rapidly than is now the case, (p. 240, ss.;) 4. From the fact, now universally conceded as an established geological result, and insisted upon by such palæontologists as H. von Meyer, O. Volger, and H. G. Bronn, that the succession of strata and petrifactions does not appear to be regular, nor such as to prove the favorite geological axiom of a gradual development, organically rising from lower to higher forms of life, (p. 256, ss.) We have therefore to abandon and decidedly to reject the cosmogenic theories of modern geology in general, and particularly this through and through pantheistic idea of a systematically proceeding development of the primeval organic inhabitants of the earth, and this the more from the fact that all these ideas owe their origin to an excessive opposition of the natural science of the present day, to the "Semetic influences" which formerly obtained a footing in geology, and are, for this very reason, of an unscientific character. The only probable theory of the origin of the petrifactions is, on the contrary, according to Pater Bosizio, the following:

That all those fossiliferous sedimentary deposits upon the surface of our earth, which modern geology has only artificially

divided into periods and formations, were not formed during the progress of creation, but subsequent to its completion, in the course of ages, by the universal deluge of history, and other similar catastrophes, (numberless and undeniable proofs of which are presented in the entire composition and structure of the present surface of our earth;) in which a great multitude of the then existing animals and plants perished, the remains of which we now find inclosed and covered up in sedimentary, clastic, and limmatic strata, in their former geographical habitat; or buried and bedded in hollows and pits, on rocky heights, in rents and gorges of mountains, whither they were swept by slimy floods; or, finally, as fossils in the different sedimentary chalk and sandstone formations, in coal veins, in deposits of slate, of marl and clay. This opinion rightfully seems the more probable, inasmuch as innumerable geological facts furnish proofs equally numberless, that the surface of our earth has actually, in the course of ages, been the theater of such mighty convulsions, inundations, volcanic eruptions, and other similar events, by which entire districts of country have been laid waste, and enormous sedimentary and lava-like deposits have been formed. It may rightfully be claimed to be the best established, since the actual facts, both of geology and palæontology, not only do not contradict, but much rather fully confirm it.—Pages 328, 329.

Although Bosizio in reality can only cite Leibnitz, Schewehzer, and Kutorga as vouchers for his opinion, he nevertheless declares it, at least according to its negative side—that is, so far as it unconditionally protests against every application of the theories and doctrines of modern geology to the interpretation of the Hexaëmeron—to be the only correct standpoint of the Catholic exegete in this matter. He demands, therefore, that we "quietly wait until geology shall have returned from her wanderings in the domain of untenable theories, and, freed from all her blunders, shall have penetrated to the exact truth." (Pages 336, 337.) This demand is in substance a very just one, inasmuch as in point of fact manifold scientific fancies are still mixed up with the geological treatment of the history of creation, particularly in all determinations relating to time. But that the result of this certainly needed retroversion of geological science must consist in a complete or nearly complete reproduction of the old diluvian hypothesis, no one who is even tolerably well acquainted with the actually attained results of geological investigation will be likely to grant. The petrifactions of the so-called diluvial formations, as also those of the uppermost tertiary strata, might

doubtless, with some show of scientific truth, be referred to the Noachian deluge, and to other great inundations and revolutions subsequent to the completion of the work of creation. But this supposition can never be extended to the petrifactions contained in the lower mountain strata, or to the formation and position of these elder strata themselves. The coal formation alone, this unmistakable product of the gradual sinking of enormous layers of plants, shows the absolute inadmissibility of a theory according to which the present constitution of the earth-crust owes its origin to the few thousand years which have elapsed since the consummation of the work of creation. The representatives of geological science will not be able either at present, nor indeed at any future time, to concur in such an opinion; on the contrary, they will always see in it an unfair ignoring of that which is real, and to a certain extent well established, in their investigations. They will therefore, at best, repay like with like; that is, oppose to the thoroughly repellant attitude which they see theologians assume in reference to their scientific labors, a no less haughty ignoration of the theological treatment of the history of creation. But even theologically viewed, the diluvian theory is not free from grave doubts and objections. For even the biblical account of the primeval history of the earth and of mankind bears witness against it, at least so far forth as the first chapter of Genesis plainly describes the origin not of a former but of the present surface of the earth with its organisms; and the animal races, whose creation Moses places on the fifth and sixth days, are clearly races not destined to extinction, but to "fruitfulness and multiplication." He also mentions but the one great flood of Noah's time, observing a perfect silence as to any other geological revolutions or catastrophes, of which one certainly needs a considerable number, in order to the satisfactory explanation of all the geological and palæontological facts. We are persuaded that, even on account of these exegetical difficulties, the diluvian hypothesis of Keil, Veith, and Bosizio will find, and retain, but few adherents, even though the just-mentioned thinkers, or others after them, should apply far greater diligence, learning, and ingenuity to its elaboration than they hitherto have applied, or rather wasted upon it.

II. In our own day, that is, since the beginning of the present century, that interpretation of the Mosaic Hexaëmeron has found far wider acceptation, which conceives of the six days as periods of indefinite duration, and thus endeavors to render their immediate identification with the geological epochs practicable. Already several Church Fathers, as, for instance, *Clement of Alexandria*, *Athanasius*, *Augustine*, have been quoted as advocates of the substance of this theory. But their expressions have been decidedly misconstrued; and as for those of Augustine, in the work "*de Genesi ad literam*," in particular, they do not contemplate the extension of the days to periods, but merely in general a spiritualistic interpretation of the six days' work as a procedure in the intellectual cognizance of the angels, (in der geistigen Erk enntniss der Engel.)* The days are not prolonged to periods of greater duration, but rather transformed into speculative ideas without the slightest reference to geological theories of any kind.

*George Cuvier*, the real creator of the entire palæontological and comparative anatomical science of our day, must be regarded as the proper father of the Hypothesis of Literal Agreement, or the theory which collates with scientific rigor the Mosaic days and the geological periods. His "Theorie de la Terre," and his "Recherches sur les ossemens fossils," have served all later advocates of this method as a pattern: not only the theologians, such as *J. P. Lange*, (Positive Dogmatik, 1851, S. 260 ss.;) *Ebrard*, ("Die Weltanschauung der Bibel und die Naturwissenschaft," in the periodical "Die Zukunft der Kirche" for 1847; also separately published 1861;) *Delitzsch*, (Comm. über die Genesis, 1853;) *Ph. Fr. Keerl*, ("Der Mensch das Ebenbild Gottes," etc., 1861; also "Der Einheit der biblischen Urgeschichte," 1863;) and *F. H. Reusch*, ("Bibel und Natur; Vorlesungen über die mosaische Urgeschichte, und ihr Verhältniss zu den Ergebnissen der Naturforschung," 1862,) but also the representatives of natural science, such as *De Luc*, *Bendant*, *Marcel de Serres*, (La Cosmogonie de Moïse com-

* That this is the real drift of the passages alluded to in the writings of Augustine (de Gen. ad lit. I. 17; IV. 34; V. 4, 5; and de Gen. ad lit. Op. imperf. c. 6, 15, etc.) has been shown with sufficient clearness by *Bosizio* in the above work, (p. 359 ss., comp. p. 195 ss.,) in opposition to his brother Jesuit *Pianciani*, who had appealed in support of his theory of Literal Agreement to several Church Fathers, particularly to Augustine.

parée aux faits géologiques), *Hugh Miller*, (The Testimony of the Rocks, or Geology in its Bearings on the two Theologies, natural and revealed, 1857), *de Rougemont*, ("Geschichte der Erde," translated from the French by Fabarius, 1856), *Pfaff*, (Schöpfungegeschichte, 1855), and *Nath. Böhner*, (Naturforschung und Culturleben," 1859; 2d edition, 1863; also "Kosmos; Bibel des Natur," Bd. I, 1864.) To illustrate the method which these authors pursue in harmonizing the Mosaic history of creation with geology, we will here give a general view of the six primeval periods of the world, as set forth by the distinguished Scotch geologist, Hugh Miller, in the work just mentioned, being the result of his combination of the six days with the most important geological epochs. He assumes:

1. An *Azoic period*, the time of the formation of the primitive rocks, (gneiss, granite, mica slate and original clay slate,) with whose fearful revolutions, partly of a neptunian, partly of a plutonian character, the first establishment of a more direct relation between the as yet unorganic life of the earth and cosmical light coincides. (Comp. Gen. i, 1–5.)

2. A *Silurian-Devonian* period, in which the origin of the transition rocks, the formation of an atmosphere, at first lowering and cloud laden, and finally the first appearance of an organic life of the lowest character, (ferns, polyps, snails, crustaceæ and certain fishes,) are to be located. (Gen. i, 6–10.)

3. A *higher Paleozoic* period, the epoch of the coal formation, during which the youthful earth was covered with a luxuriant though tolerably uniform Flora, whose tall, juicy, dense-leaved, and for the most part very fantastically shaped growths, could only grow as in a hot-house, since they lacked as yet the powerful and unintercepted influence of sunlight. (Gen. i, 11–13.)

4. An *older Secondary period*, the epoch of the so-called Permean and Triassic formations, characterized by a comparative poverty as regards new forms of vegetable and animal life and organic remains generally, but probably coinciding with the first visible appearance of the light and life-giving constellations of the now cloudless sky. (Gen. i, 14–19.)

5. A *Mesozoic*, or *later Secondary period*, the period of the liassic, oolite, and chalk formations, distinguished for its numerous and in part colossal and monstrous shaped winged, finned,

and creeping animals, and designated on account of the prevalence of the latter class as the "Age of Reptiles." (Gen. i, 20–23.)

6. A *Cainozoic or tertiary epoch*, the period of the "beasts of the field" immediately preceding the human race; in other words, those now partially extict and partially remaining representatives of the huge mammals, particularly of the class of the pachyderms and ruminants; as, for instance, mastodons, dinotheria, elephants, mammoth deer, etc. (Gen. i, 24, 25.)

Similar to this are the adjustments proposed by the other advocates of this hypothesis, except that the latter almost without exception place the origin of the very lowest organisms in the third instead of the second day of creation, (Gen. i, 11,) thus locating the Silurian-Devonian group in the third period, and uniting it with the group of coal formations. This is the course adopted by *Reusch* and *Pianciani*, the latest defenders of the theory of Literal Agreement, both of whom belong to the Romish Church, but both of whom are well read in the entire domain of scientific literature pertaining to this subject, and display no small ingenuity, spirit, and taste in the treatment of their theme.

*Reusch* (Professor of Theology in Bonn) assumes in his lectures, entitled "Bible and Nature," two grand geogenic periods, of which the first, or *pre-organic* one, embraces the formation of the primitive and the oldest sedimentary rocks, and of the sea, and reaches down to the first half of the third day of creation, or to Gen. i, 10; while the second, or *organic* one, begins with the formation of the lowest vegetable (and animal) organisms, that is, with Gen. i, 11, and includes an indefinite number of successive creations of this kind, together with numerous evolutions and revolutions of which, however, Genesis gives no account. On the contrary, according to him, Moses only suggests in his third, fourth, fifth, and sixth days, the grand characteristic advances in this organically rising process of creation. He represents therein the individual creative epochs as six different acts, or, as it were, tableaux of one majestic drama which had been revealed to him by means of a series of prophetic visions from God.*

* This view, according to which the Hexaëmeron is conceived of as a prophetic vision of the drama of creation, was borrowed by *Reusch* from *Kurtz*, ("Bibel und

The Jesuit *Pianciani*, President of Philosophical Faculty of the University at Rome, (died 1862,) defended as long ago as the year 1851, in his "Commentatio in historiam Creationis Mosaicam," the hypothesis of Literal Agreement, and represented the same as demanded by the results of modern scientific investigation, and even as at least partially supported by the authority of the Church Fathers. (See above.) In the treatise "*Cosmogonia naturale comparata col Genesi*," published, shortly before his death, he holds fast in substance to the same opinion, and endeavors, by a more detailed investigation of the geological facts thus far established, to demonstrate its truth; in doing which he likewise exhibits a thorough acquaintance with natural science, and a theological attitude and method, not only, as a general thing, very candid, but even comparatively liberal. Here he no longer attempts, as in the former treatise, to explain the dubious fact that the oldest fossiliferous strata contain far more remains of animal than of vegetable organisms—a phenomenon which seems to conflict with the Mosaic description of the commencement of organic creations on the third day—by the supposition, that perhaps the multitudinous zoophytes and echinoderma of these oldest formations were classed by the author of Genesis with the grasses and herbs, but by referring to the traces and remains of a perished Flora, which already existed in the transition rocks, especially in that plainly phytogenous rock, the anthracite of the Silurian-Devonian group. In connection with these and similar somewhat too refined attempts to solve the difficulties appertaining to this theory, he also calls attention with suitable emphasis to the fact, that the narrator in the numeration of particulars proceeds necessarily in a summary manner, and accordingly not with exact scientific completeness; and that his plain intention is to describe in each case only the beginning and the especially characteristic features of the individual divine acts of creation, not their entire progress and full extent.

That which is usually particularly objected to the theory of Literal Agreement, that is, the exegetical difficulty or impossibility of conceiving of the days of the Mosaic record as lengthy

Astronomie," S. 73, ss; 531, ss.) It has in like manner been appropriated by *Hugh Miller*, (see above work, p. 157,) and other adherents of the hypothesis under consideration.

periods, does not seem to us so weighty and significant as is generally represented. For that the biblical historian of creation can have meant no ordinary days with his days of creation seems sufficiently clear from various facts: (1) that he reports the creation of sun, moon, and stars, these chronometers of the earth as not having taken place until the fourth day; (2) that the separate works of creation are very unequally distributed among the six days; (3) that the seventh day, in which God rested from his labors, cannot possibly be understood in the sense of an ordinary day of twenty-four hours, (comp. John v, 17; Heb. iv, 10;) in general, from the fact, that the entire description is manifestly arranged with intentional and therefore idealizing reference to the institution of the sacred sabbatic cyclus. If one furthermore takes into consideration the circumstance already noticed by *Origenes*, (Comm. in Eccl. xviii, 1,) that the expression "day" is used immediately at the close of the account of the six days' work, (Gen. ii, 4), as a comprehensive designation of this whole series of times, there can no longer be any doubt as to the tropical signification and elasticity of this term, and there is no further necessity, in order to its proof, to quote the familiar words of Moses in the nineteenth Psalm: "A thousand years in thy sight are as a day," etc.

A far better founded objection to the hypothesis of Literal Agreement, and one far more difficult to refute, seems to us to lie in the nature of the geological facts thus far ascertained, and in the fundamental peculiarity of the theory of creation which geologists have deduced from them. According to this theory, the stages of organic development *did not proceed, as in the first chapter of Genesis, from plants to the aquatic animals and birds, and then to land animals, but animals and plants were called into being contemporaneously, and proceeded in regular steps from lower and more imperfect to higher and more perfect forms of life.* In fact, in the oldest geological epochs, the so-called palæozoic period, the remains of animal organisms appear in much greater numbers and variety than those of vegetable ones. To the seven to eight hundred species of fossil plants which have thus far been discovered in the strata of this epoch, there are at least five thousand corresponding species of animals. To these belong, furthermore, not only the very lowest classes and orders, but also many vertebrates,

particularly fishes, of an organization by no means so very imperfect. Not less difficult is it to reconcile the characteristic peculiarities of the later geological epochs with the biblical account of the last three days of creation. In the mesozoic period, for instance, the reptile races are by no means so predominant as to really seem to justify Miller's above quoted designation of the epoch as the "Age of Reptiles;" while on the other hand the petrifactions of birds are in this epoch so extremely rare as to cause the co-ordination or rather identification of this period with the fifth day of creation to appear very precarious. In addition to all this, there still remains in conclusion this great difficulty, that the geological epochs can only, with great difficulty: and not without much violent and capricious wresting, be reduced to six great periods; and that precisely the latest and most learned representatives of geological science, particularly Lyell and his school, affirm a far greater number of stages and epochs in the history of the formation of the earth. With this is connected another dubious circumstance, namely: that for the "evenings" or nights, which, according to Genesis, preceded the different creative days, correspondences in the process of the geological development can be found only with difficulty and by means of rather artificial hypotheses.* As a matter of fact, no advocate of the theory of Literal Agreement has as yet succeeded in establishing a harmony between the Hexaëmeron and the ascertained results of geological investigation, so complete and satisfactory in detail as to raise his theory above the worth of a mere hypothesis, and to cause it to appear adapted to win over such as had been till that time of another opinion.

III. Our last remark is equally applicable to the third of the theories here to be considered, the so-called *Restitutionary Hypothesis.* According to this theory the developments and revolutions of the surface of the earth which caused the present geological strata, together with their petrifactions, are neither

* To these belong those "twilight periods of morning dawn and evening decline" which Hugh Miller, in his above-mentioned construction of the Hexaëmeron, has attempted to trace in the lower new red series, ("Rothen Todtliegenden,") the eocene formation of Lyell, and in other similar formations, which, through lying between strata rich in fossil remains, are nevertheless distinguished for their comparative destitution of petrifactions of every kind, especially those of new and characteristic structural forms.

to be located in the six days of creation nor subsequent to them; they belong rather to an anterior time. They fall within that indefinite primeval period of the history of our planet which is indicated by the words, "And the earth was without form and void." (Gen. i, 2.) The six days' work is nothing but a final restoration of the earth's surface, which had fallen into chaotic confusion and disorder in consequence of ever-recurring subversions of successive organic creations—an orderly, organically progressing fitting up of the earth for the occupancy of man, accomplished in six days of twenty-four hours' duration. This hypothesis, which plainly affords the twofold advantage, first, of allowing us to interpret the first chapter of Genesis in the most literal manner possible, and secondly, of enabling us at the same time to grant the most extravagant demands of the geologist in respect to the immensely long duration of the formation of the earth, was originally proposed by Thomas Chalmers in his "Review of Cuvier's Theory of the Earth," written in the year 1814. From him it was afterward adopted by the English geologist Buckland, in his *Vindiciæ Geologicæ*, (1820,) his *Religiosæ Diluvianæ*, (1823,) as also in his "Bridgewater Treatise,"(1836,) translated into German by Werner, (1837,) a work known far beyond the bounds of England, and influential in the widest circles. In like manner, by the recently deceased Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, in the fifth and sixth of his "Twelve Lectures on the Connection of Science with Revelation," (1835,) fifth edition, (1861;) by the learned natural theologian of London, J. Pye Smith, ("Relations between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science," 1839, fourth edition, 1848;) the North American, Edward Hitchcock, ("The Religion of Geology," 1851;) the Frenchman, Victor de Bonald, (*Moïse et les Géologues Modernes;*) and among the Germans by G. H. von Schubert, "Geschichte der Natur," second edition, part first;) Andreas Wagner, ("Geschichte der Urwell," second edition, 1858;) and J. H. Kurtz, the well-known Church historian and commentator in Dorpat. The last named has defended this theory with especial warmth, and no small ingenuity, in the different editions of his much-read work entitled, "The Bible and Astronomy," particularly in the lately issued fifth edition mentioned at the head of this

article. From the fact that Dr. Kurtz found at the very outset an ally in Hengstenberg, (see Evang. Kirchenzeitung, 1846, No. 37 ss.,) and later, also, succeeded in winning over to the substance of the theory *Delitzsch*, (Comm. zur Genesis, third edition, 1860,) as also several other Lutheran theologians of reputation, this hypothesis has attained, at least on German soil, to a certain extent, the name of being the only orthodox conception of the process of creation, authoritative above all others for the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. Still even this theory does not afford an entirely satisfactory solution of the existing difficulties, either the exegetical or the geological ones. Opposed to it, when viewed exegetically, stands the simple manner in which the author of the Hexaëmeron describes the origin of light, of the clouds, of water and land, of the growths and animals, not as repeated, but as original creations, as also his complete silence respecting that series of successive creative and destructive processes which, according to the Restitutionists, must fall in the period designated in Genesis i, 2. Of an interference of Satan and his demons with this assumed succession of primeval creations and catastrophes during the *Tohu va Bohu* epoch; of a creative co-operation of these fallen spirits in the origination of the deformed, monstrous, and horrid forms of the animal and vegetable world in this period; of a continued struggling and striving of God's creative agency, aiming at a paradisaically beautiful and glorious form of the earth, with those dark powers from the abyss—of all these and similar antecedents of the six days' work conceived of as a restoration, the Mosaic text reports not a solitary syllable. Its simple language cannot possibly be harmonized with this hypothesis borrowed from the school of the Theosophists, (Böhner, Oetinger, St. Martin, F. von Meyer, etc.,) without ascribing to it a significance which it does not in reality possess.

Viewing, furthermore, the Restitutionary Hypothesis from the geological standpoint, one must raise against it, at least in its customary and absolute form, the weighty objection that that succession of primeval processes of destruction which, by assumption, was the pre-supposition and occasion of the restitutionary work of the six days, cannot possibly, according to the well-ascertained results of the most recent geological investi-

gation, have had an all-comprehending character, affecting the whole earth; but, on the contrary, must have ever extended, only to particular portions of the earth's surface of greater or less extent, so that according to this the *Tohu va Bohu* condition, with its primeval malformations, would have continued in many places in its full measure and force down into the concluding and perfecting development of the six days' work. The supposition of a local limitation of the restitutionary work, according to which only a certain portion of the earth, namely, the surroundings of Paradise, (southwestern Asia,) was affected by the restorative agency of God in the Hexaëmeron—this particular (non-universal) restitutionary hypothesis, elaborated especially by J. Pye Smith and Hitchcock, is not only liable to the same exegetical objections as the absolute or universal one, but has furthermore to contend with special physical difficulties which lie in the geological character of that portion of the earth's surface. In addition to all this, it strikes one as remarkable, unaccountable, we might almost say an offense against good taste, to assume for the closing up restitutionary work a net duration of six times twenty-four hours, while on the other hand the preceding processes of revolution are assumed to have occupied millions of years; a contrast which does not wholly lose its harshness and singularity even when one gives up the strict, literal understanding of the six days and extends them to periods of many years', or even many centuries' duration, as several of the above-mentioned Restitutionists have done.

IV. The difficulties which thus accompany each of the above three methods of procedure have induced several of the very latest apologetical interpretators of Genesis to try a fourth, which in many respects may be regarded as the indifference, in another as the higher unity and harmony, of the three already considered. According to the *Theory of Ideal Agreement*, the author of the first chapter of Genesis describes the course of creation in a manner perfectly true and answering to the reality, but not in a manner literally accurate; so that the agreement of his account with the course of the earth's formation as ascertained from geological facts, can never extend to all particulars, but must, on the contrary, ever remain only an ideal and general one. Following in the wake

of Buckland, Delitzsch, Keerl, and others, who, starting either with the Restitutionary or Literal Agreement hypothesis, have endeavored to combine the fundamental principle of these two theories, the Catholic Michelis, and the Protestant Francis W. Schultz, have lately elaborated and defended this theory of Ideal Agreement; the former in different numbers of his apologetical periodical, "Nature and Revelation;" the latter in the work named at the head of this article, "The History of Creation, according to Natural Science and Holy Scripture."

According to Michelis* the design of the Mosaic record is merely, in general, to communicate the fact of the actualization of the divine idea of creation and the creature, not especially the *how* of its actualization. The narration is therefore to be conceived of as decidedly ideal, and not to be taken in a strict literal sense; especially as it does not rise above the immediate sense-surroundings of man, and employs anthropomorphic expressions in relation to God. The parallel accounts of creation given by Genesis and geology are related to each other somewhat as two biographical representations of Charlemagne would be, of which the one enumerates in strictly chronological order the fortunes of the man and the events of his reign, while the other contemplates him in his action according to particular points of view, and portrays him, for example, successively as conqueror, statesman, father, Christian, etc., without in any way infringing upon the truth of history by this ideal arrangement of the material. Such a representation, arranged according to the *material*, and not according to the *chronological* principle of division, is the biblical record of creation. Its days are not designations of duration, but of creative acts. They are points of view designed to make plain the casual connection, not the genetic succession, of the phenomena of the shaping of the earth, and only in condescension to the powers of human conception are they represented as a succession of creative acts. In defense of this opinion, Michelis appeals to Augustine's attempt at an *expositio mystica* of the six days' work, (de Gen. ad lit. IV, 34,) and to Thomas Aquinas, who, in the train of that great Chuch Father, was inclined to reduce the six days to "*sex rerum gen-*

* "Natur und Offenbarung," Vol. I, 102 ss.; II, 61 ss.; III, 238 ss.; IV, 498 ss.; VIII, 38, 91 ss., etc.

*era sine distinctione temporis.*" In so doing he manifestly forgets that both of these Fathers certainly regarded the succession of the Hexaëmeron as the actual order in which God not only conceived of the creation, but actually called it into being; while *he* attributes to the Mosaic six days' work, in chronological respect, a purely ideal signification, and substitutes, as descriptive of the actual history of the earth's formation, the theory of modern geologists, which essentially differs from Genesis, particularly in the point of declaring the creation of plants and animals to have been contemporaneous. (See above, II.)

Quite similar to Michelis's method of procedure is that of Professor Schultz, in Breslau, in the fourth and last of the works which stand at the head of this paper; a work distinguished above most similar issues of the present day, not only by its great wealth of information, but also particularly by the exhaustive thoroughness and keenness of its exegetical portions. After a preliminary establishment of the decidedly inspired (*offenbarungsmässigen*) character of the first chapter of Genesis, as a document containing "not human opinions but divine and eternal truths," and after subjecting the customary attempts at reconciliation, particularly the Restitutionary and the Literal Agreement hypothesis, to an acute, perhaps here and there *too* acute, criticism, he proceeds to answer the question "whether the customary [orthodox] opinion is really correct, that a divinely revealed representation excludes every non-agreement with reality, even in reference to temporal duration and similar externalities?" He answers this question with a decided negative, and accordingly maintains with emphasis that the Hexaëmeron has only an ideal descriptive character, that is, that it relates *what is true*, but not *immediately real*. He regards it as in this respect analogous to many descriptions in the Old Testament prophecies, and finds the explanation of its peculiar form in the primeval institution of the Sabbath. According to him the biblical record of creation is a product, on the one hand, of the knowledge of certain fundamental truths of religion intimately connected with the belief in God, (particularly a knowledge of God as creator, of the necessity of an orderly progression in this creative agency, and of a final closing up of the same,

that is, a rest, a transition from the work of creation to that of preservation; see § xi, pp. 94–102,) on the other hand "of a diviner's glance penetrating deep into the world and its varied relations." The main thought and essential contents of this record is, according to him, that there were "six great works which God accomplished, three by which he established and set off the different domains of nature, and three by which he filled them with occupants; and that, though he commenced them in a certain sense contemporaneously, he nevertheless carried on their formation, placed them in relation to each other, and completed them, in a certain order of succession, after which he passed from the work of creation to that of preservation, or, according to the Old Testament expression, rested." (Pages 331, 332.) By reason of this free interpretation, which allows him to regard merely these facts as the kernel and substance of the record, he sees himself in a position to make with ease and unconstrainedly those concessions to modern natural science which the Restitutionists and the ordinary partisans of the theory of Literal Agreement often effect only by means of very artificial hypotheses. He does not, for instance, think himself "by any means bound to regard that time of preparation described in Genesis i, 2, as so short as an ordinary night, though it is plainly enough treated as a mere night," in which he manifestly approaches the fundamental thought of the Restitutionary Hypothesis; and again he declares that "the fact that the author of the record has described the creation of light, the fixing of the firmament, the separation of dry land from the water, etc., as works each of a single day, can neither occasion nor justify the limitations of the periods spoken of to the space of twelve hours," in which he lends his concurrence to the fundamental principle of the advocates of Literal Agreement. His conception of the biblical record does not preclude him from the supposition that the preparatory work described in verse 2 may have reached far into the period of the creation of light; and the creation of light, the fixing of the firmament, the separation of dry land, and the creation of vegetation far into the period of the creation of animals; since, if this record has once compressed these works into much shorter periods of time than they in reality occcupied, it may also easily have

represented processes actually contemporaneous as having taken place in succession. In short, he claims, by virtue of his ideal apprehension of the Hexaëmeron, to have precisely the same freedom as those reconcilers who conceive of the days as extended periods; and particularly, by reason of his hypothesis of a mainly contemporaneous progress of the different creative acts, to be free from all embarrassment "in reference to such points also as the contemporaneousness of the rock formations, the vegetable and animal creations, demonstrated by geology." Page 330.

We see from the above that Dr. Schultz, in point of fact, occupies the same standpoint, and proceeds according to the same principles, as most modern advocates of the theory of Literal Agreement, particularly Delitzsch, Keerl, Reusch, Böhner; only that in his estimate of the rhetorical character and theological significance of the Mosaic record of creation, he proceeds in a somewhat more refined manner than these, and understands better than they, by means of a more careful discrimination between the biblical narration and the geological account of the process of creation, to preserve the peculiarly delicate and poetic aroma with which this oldest record of divine revelation is surrounded. That he rejects the interpretation of the days in the sense of periods, as decidedly unjustifiable in an exegetical point of view, and in general pronounces a somewhat harsh judgment upon the hypothesis of Literal Agreement, with which after all his own stands in such close relationship, we can only regard as inconsistent and insufficiently sustained. For, in truth, he also regards the six days as periods of unequal and indeterminable duration, and that the general biblical *usus loquendi* in reference to the word יום affords a certain exegetical right to this tropical conception of the term, he certainly cannot earnestly think of questioning, much less regard as refuted by that advanced on pages 316 and 317 against Delitzsch. We are of the opinion, however, that Dr. Schultz will be inclined to acknowledge the relationship of his method of procedure with that of the partisans of the Literal Agreement theory, and to approach the latter still more nearly just in proportion as the progress of geological science, by sifting, reconstructing, and better establishing the now current theories of geogony, shall cause both

the candid representatives of natural science and theologians acquainted with this realm of knowledge to generally adopt riper and better supported views respecting the actual process of the formation of the earth, and thus prepare the way for the removal of so many real or apparent difficulties now existing in this department of Christian apology. For, in one point, Keil, Bosizio, and the other adherents of the above-considered Diluvian hypothesis, are, after all, unquestionably right, and that is in maintaining that the so-called "results" of geological and palæontological science consist as yet to a great extent in empty *fancies* and fruitless *hypotheses*, and that it is therefore the prime duty of the defender of the Bible to quietly wait until that transformation of these hypotheses into tenable opinions, which we are certainly justified in expecting, shall have been successfully accomplished.

## Art. III.—OUR ITINERANCY.

[ARTICLE SECOND.]

1. Our system secures to each Church a pastor at all times. We do not wish to deal in unneighborly comparisons, yet we point to the fact that there are in our own land large and influential bodies of Christians who leave the congregations and the ministers individually to manage for themselves; who agree that a "settled pastorate" is better than any itinerant system, and yet their annual reports show that from year to year nearly one half of their Churches are without settled pastors, and dependent on temporary supplies. For this state of things there must be a cause; and what is it? Is it because they find it so difficult to make permanent arrangements? Or is it because there is little desire for permanence? One, or both, of these reasons must lie at the foundation of the evil. The fatal fact cited is itself sufficient to offset all the defects of the itinerancy.

Our Churches, on the other hand, all have pastors. The weakest society is provided for as certainly as the strongest. And all have pastors all the while. There are no exceptions, save under circumstances for which no system can provide, as in the case of the death of the pastor. When a minister is

assigned to a Church, he remains its pastor till the appointed officer rises at the close of the session of conference and announces a new distribution of labor; and then the same hour that ends his pastorate installs his successor.

2. The itineraucy secures for the pastor a fair degree of independence, enabling him to "speak boldly, as he ought to speak."

Entire independence on either side is not good. This is one of the evils of State Churches. Where the government seeks to control the Church, the object sought is not the good of the Church. It is rather a politic move on the part of the "powers that be," who seek to prop their thrones by enlisting the religion of the country in their favor. The religious leaders even of idolaters are recognized as wielding great influence among the people. Tyrants and timid rulers, apprehensive of revolt and revolution, aim to fortify themselves by making the ministry creatures of their own, bound to the throne by the principle that "the ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib." Consequently, the conditions on which the state pastors hold their places refer to the head of the state, rather than the Great Head of the Church, and loyalty is of more importance to them than piety and correct doctrine. Having a legal claim on the people for their salary, and at the same time not amenable to the people for the manner in which they do their duty, there is a dangerous tendency to ease and worldliness, and to be satisfied with a cold performance of the services prescribed by the law. The pastor is not only sufficiently independent of his people to preach the whole truth boldly if he will, but to tempt him to be indifferent whether he preaches it at all.

Turning to the congregational plan of Church government, we find that the pastor is too much in the power of the people. If indeed he is a man of uncommon acceptability, he may feel at his ease. But take an average man. Suppose that he is well pleased with his position, and hopes to retain it, determines to retain it as long as possible. We will also imagine him a little past his prime, and beginning to suspect that the younger portions of his flock regard him as an old man. There is an influential man in his Church who has a large circle of relatives and friends, and around whom a strong party can easily

be gathered; this man is pursuing a course detrimental to religion and will not be reproved. Half a score of worldly pew-holders take offense at the pastor's plain-dealing sermons, and threaten to secede if he will not cease from his rebukes, and content himself with "preaching the Gospel." The pastor may be poor, and have a dependent family, and a loss of his present position will be well-nigh fatal to him. His years, his moderate abilities, will render it a hard thing for him to find a new charge; and so he is in a strait between duty to souls and duty to those dependent upon him; and there is danger that in the conflict, conscience will suffer. If he already knows that his hold upon the affections of a part of his people is slender, the temptation is stronger, and the peril to conscience greater.

On the itinerant plan things are more equal. To be removed at the end of one year is not of necessity embarrassing to the pastor. In the process of disciplining the unruly, he may provoke an opposition which will render his longer stay unpleasant to him; but if he has done his work wisely and well, he goes his way unharmed, and leaves a clear field for his successor. If those who are provoked by his faithfulness hold the purse, and cut off his supplies, the temporary lack may be made up by future abundance. Thus the unfair and unsafe dependence of the congregational plan is avoided, as well as the equally unsafe independence of the State Church system. Tested by practical results, in outspoken boldness of reproof of popular sins and vices, as slavery and the use of intoxicating drinks, we are not ashamed to compare the itinerants of the Methodist Episcopal Church with the ministry of any other denomination in the land. And if it is evident that in these things we have excelled others, it may be candid as well as modest in us to say that the difference is more due to our better system of ministerial labor than to clearer reason and deeper piety. Entire independence of the people, and entire dependence upon them, are both evils. The itinerant system is free from both extremes, and therefore works to the advantage of the pastor, who is bound to declare all the counsel of God, and of the people, who need all that counsel.

3. The itinerancy furnishes the means of securing a change of pastors without inflicting dishonor or injustice.

From a want of adaptation, or from circumstances which neither the pastor nor people can control, it may be expedient that he should leave his present field of labor. Where the congregational plan obtains, it is difficult to effect the change. To canvass the Church, inquiring who would like to have the minister resign, is an ungracious business, very apt to damage those engaged in it. To oust the pastor often destroys the unity of the Church, and "separates chief friends." Even where there is a clear and strong conviction among the people that a change is demanded for the good of the cause, there is often a resolute minority who resist to the last, and make the process disastrous. A quarrel over the removal of the old pastor is a sure precursor of numberless others in securing a new one. For these reasons, and more, the considerate members of the Church seek a change only when it becomes evident, not only that their best exertions put forth steadily, year after year, have failed to achieve success under the present arrangement, but also that present evils are so great as to warrant incurring the risks involved in the attempt to secure a change.

If the pastor is a popular man, and he seeks the change, people are prone to talk it over, and try to learn his motives. They wonder whether he is becoming mercenary, and is aiming at a higher salary elsewhere; or whether he is justified in leaving his people by some lack of cordiality, harmony, or liberality on their part. If the people seek the change, it can hardly fail to be construed as a reflection on the minister, his talents, his piety, his fitness, or something else.

The process may be conducted with all delicacy and kindness of speech. They may declare that they respect the good brother, and will always continue to do so; that they hope and fervently pray that he may be very useful and happy in some new field. Nevertheless, after all these soft words, there remains the palpable fact, that for some reason, good or bad, through some fault or some misfortune, he has failed to secure the affections of his people, and to render his ministrations generally acceptable. Consequently he goes forth to the ecclesiastical market-place with a suspicious mark upon him. When the congregation of a Church seeking a pastor see in the pulpit a candidate who has evidently been some time in the ministry, they instinctively ask, "Who is he? Where has

he been settled? *Why does he not stay there?*" There is a prejudice against men who cannot keep their places. When the congregation seek a new pastor, therefore, they generally prefer a young man who has never been settled, or one who is now settled over some little Church who would gladly keep him if they could, but who cannot bid very high for his services. This is not because age and experience are not respected, but because there is a fear that the man who has lost his Church is not the right man, a fear that the causes which effected past changes may continue to operate.

Now, under all modes of distributing ministerial labor, there will be cases of failure. If a man lacks the elements of acceptability and usefulness, there is nothing but failure for him. One system may keep him afloat a little longer than another, but sooner or later he will go to the bottom. Still, circumstances may render a change of location expedient where there is no fault in the minister. He may unconsciously come in collision with inveterate local prejudices, or be made, against his will, a bone of contention between warring factions in the Church. He may find cases of unfaithfulness and inconsistency among his people, and set himself resolutely to the work of reforming abuses. He may succeed, and render the Church far purer and stronger than before, and yet, in the process of applying discipline, incur in certain quarters the charge of harshness. Perhaps even those whom he saves from ruinous error may feel cool toward him, just as convalescent lunatics for a time indulge unkind feelings toward the skillful physician who has brought them to their senses.

But whether it be through misfortune or fault, removals and changes do sometimes become necessary. On the congregational plan there must be a debate and a canvassing of opinions; reasons are urged on this side and on that, and when the discussion is once fairly inaugurated evil is inevitable. The pastor may be thrust out of his place under circumstances which hinder him in securing another, and send him away wounded in heart and in reputation, or he may stave off the crisis for the time, and remain in his Church; but in either case there is a minority who are sore and dissatisfied. The change, however desirable, can hardly be secured without loss of reputation and of friendship.

Here, then, is one of the advantages of our itinerant system: a change, where expedient, can be effected quietly, and without inflicting needless injury on minister or people. If there be a real fault in the pastor, the authorities may administer due rebuke, and then, by placing him in a new location, give him a new trial, and prevent his one error from proving fatal to his usefulness and happiness. If the people are in the wrong, they too can be admonished and begin again, wiser by sad experience.

4. The itinerant system gives each Church the benefit of the varied endowments of many ministers.

Very few men combine in themselves all the qualifications desirable in a minister. Most men are one-sided in native character, one-sided in acquirement, one-sided by habit. The learning which demands the attention of him who would be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works," spreads out into a field of infinite extent; and no man is likely to cultivate the whole of it with the same care and success. Thus there is really a virtual division of labor. Some become powerful in stirring the conscience of the sinner, and the good which they do is chiefly of this kind. The power of others is felt most in the Church, leading believers on to a higher spirituality and a deeper experience. Others still train the zeal of the Church, and rouse all around them to active labors in the cause of God. One man is by nature and by habit a reasoner, another a poet, a third an impassioned declaimer. One is sure to convince the intellect; another is equally sure to touch the heart. One is a "son of thunder," another is a "son of consolation." And because of these varied gifts, acquirements, temperaments, every minister is peculiarly fitted to reach a certain class of mind and heart among the people. The rude strength of one will gain the attention of some who are neither attracted nor impressed by the gentle modes of approach which win others. The gravity and solemnity which secure the confidence of the aged may frighten children, and be less attractive to hopeful minds of all ages than would a more cheerful type of character and manners.

Is it asked which of these is good and desirable? We answer, *all*. All these varieties of mental structure and acquirement are good each in the place and for the purpose

for which God intended it. They are like the planes, the chisels, the saws, in a complete chest of tools, no two alike, because there are so many kinds of work to be done. They are like the multiplied pipes of an organ, all different, yet all needed for the perfection of the harmony. The itinerant system gives each congregation the use of the whole set of instruments. Every class of mind is addressed, in its turn, by the one most likely to reach it. Thus the logical and the poetic, the sensitive, the grave, and the gay, the sad and the hopeful, are appealed to appropriately and powerfully. Thus the gray-haired servant of God, the heedless youth, the mature man, and the laughing child recognize the messenger sent especially to them. Thus the minister who is strong in one part of theology gives way to a successor equally strong in another, and in time the Church receives the whole. Thus the Church hears doctrine, history, prophecy, the Gospel and the law, the whole circle of divine truth, and learns to be hopeful and fearful, active and meditative, spiritual and practical, devotional and conscientious, and is rounded into completeness of Christian knowledge and character.

5. The itinerancy keeps ministers and people in vigorous action. There is no place for dull monotony to drag its slow length along year after year. Our rapid changes rouse the Churches and keep them awake. Every new distribution of ministerial labor inaugurates new campaigns against sin and error, and summons the sacramental host to the battle. With a new leader, fresh courage and hope spring up, and the sinews of effort are strung anew. The pastor, too, feels the quickening impulse. Every change of his field of action puts him again on trial. Whatever the past may have been, however solid his reputation and acceptable his ministry, he feels, when he begins his labors in his new charge, that here he has a weighty responsibility to meet, a work to do, and a name to win. He looks upon new faces, and feels that to these new hearers his sermons, his exhortations, all the varied mental accumulations of the years that are gone, are fresh, have the charm of novelty, and are therefore doubly interesting and impressive. He is brought into communion with immortal souls who a little while ago were strangers to him, and from whom the recurring changes of the system will soon remove

him, perhaps forever. What he does must be done quickly. The memory of former successes remains to cheer him to effort. He is away from the scene of any former defeat which he may have suffered, and remembers only that he may be warned. He is extricated from any difficulties into which he may have been hastily or heedlessly drawn elsewhere, and is free to put forth his best energies for the sake of his divine Master and the souls committed to his hands. Thus his removal to a new field of labor is as the renewing of his divine call to the ministry, his commission to preach the blessed Gospel of peace.

Moreover, the itinerant system renders available the whole strength of the ministry. The appointing power looks over the entire field, sees what needs to be done, and knows where to find the man to do it. This gives the operations of the Church a unity, a celerity, and a force attainable under no other plan of organization.

The itinerancy, in many important respects, benefits the minister.

1. It secures for him a pastorate so long as he is able to work effectively in the Gospel field.

Under other systems, when the young man who believes that he is called of God to preach his word, has completed his preparatory studies, the next thing is to secure a place in which to begin the good work. This gives rise to what is called "candidating," that is, traveling in search of a call, and preaching specimen sermons in vacant Churches. We are aware that men of extraordinary power have little to fear under any system; but to diffident young men, trembling under a sense of their inexperience, and deeply impressed with a view of the solemn nature of their mission, this candidating must be a painful, if not a humiliating process. Each aspirant knows that just in proportion to the desirableness of the place will be the numbers and eagerness of rivals, and the danger that, whoever wins, there will be a minority who favor some other candidate, and who are disappointed, if not irritated and embittered, by the rejection of their favorite. Every system, as we have said, must be judged by the way it works under ordinary circumstances; and young men of average ability are very uneasy, if not unhappy, while undergoing this advertising process in reference to their first settlement.

But these difficulties, so annoying to a sensitive young man, become really distressing in the case of a minister of only average attractiveness, with a dependent family, and a little past middle life, who finds himself under the necessity of securing a new pastoral charge. His years are not in his favor. The great majority of any ordinary congregation are younger than he, and naturally prefer a pastor nearer their own age. The fact that he has left his former Church, explain it as he will, creates the suspicion that there has been a fault or a failure somewhere; and thus while he is preaching his trial discourse his hearers are coldly criticising the man and his sermon, the matter and the manner, and trying to discover something which will account for his leaving his people. He knows all this, and prays, and trembles, and perspires under the weight. The dread of this keeps many a man from leaving a Church where he is conscious that his acceptability is on the wane, and where he sees little hope of usefulness or of happiness. He fears that if he cannot stay where he is he will not easily find another place. And if he does find another Church, it may be after an interval of many months; and in the mean time he has neither home, nor salary, nor employment, and debt is accumulating at a fearful rate. These things lead many a minister to hold on where he is, though he knows that his stay is as annoying to the people as it is painful to him. Thus cruel as they are, he bears the ills he has, rather than "fly to those he knows not of."

Our system, on the contrary, secures a field for every laborer as long as life and health to labor are given him of God. Our young men have indeed a term of probation assigned them at the beginning; and all through life there is constant inquiry in regard the minister's acceptability and usefulness, and he must take a higher or lower level, as he proves to be. Nevertheless, if the preacher be able to perform acceptable labor at all, the Church places him, without anxiety or loss on his part, in that portion of the field where, in the judgment of those on whom devolves this responsibility, he may best serve the cause of God. This feature of our economy is certainly worth something both to ministers and people, as it saves them both from some unpleasant and unprofitable things.

2. The itinerancy makes the minister not wholly dependent

on the favor of the people. Complete independence and entire dependence are equally undesirable, and apt to be detrimental, as we have shown in another place. We contend that in this the itinerancy attains the just middle ground, making the minister in a degree amenable to his people, yet not compelling him to flatter their weakness and touch gently their sins, or be set adrift upon a stream which has swept many a one out of the active ministry.

3. The itinerancy permits the minister to give his time and mental force to the preparation of a comparatively small number of sermons, and is therefore favorable to thorough preparation for the pulpit.

This may seem to some a small matter, but let us look at it. The idea of the unthinking hearer is that he who preaches *ex tempore*, as it is called, stands up before his audience, and utters what occurs to him at the moment just as it occurs; that he who uses notes, more or less voluminous, sits down at some odd hour, when he happens to have nothing else to do, and writes at his ease all he wants without care or effort. We know that able sermons have been preached at very short notice; but we are also persuaded that it is presumption in any man to expect to be uniformly acceptable and useful without much prayer, much reading and thinking, much hard work. He who relies upon his ready utterance may do well when wind and tide are in his favor; but the student and the thinker alone is reliable at all times. To prepare good sermons which really "feed the flock of God," to do this month after month ably, acceptably, with no signs of flagging either in the speaker or the hearers, is no small thing. A sermon that is uttered in thirty minutes may contain the condensed results of days of earnest, prayerful research. If the preacher addresses the same people from year to year, how great the labor of keeping up the supply of new material. If he remains many years, how much strong argument, beautiful illustration, and fervent appeal, become useless after a single utterance. The itinerancy, by rendering it possible to use the same preparations more than once, gives time for thorough study. He who must prepare his two sermons a week has more than he ought to do. He will work in haste, and seldom produce a discourse that seems to his own mind complete. He knows

that no man can retain in his memory, in available shape, the mass of ideas, arguments, illustrations sufficient for a ten years' ministry, and so he employs notes in his pulpit labors. This necessitates a ceaseless use of the pen. And a written sermon hastily prepared is apt to be less effective than an extempore discourse. Each mode has its advantages. The extempore sermon will have more vivacity, more emotional force; the written sermon ought to have more thought, expressed in better language. One has more powder, and the other more ball; whereas powder and ball are both needed. If, then, the preacher be so afraid of repeating himself, of falling into the use of stereotyped expressions, on all occasions, that he is compelled to write his sermons, and is compelled to write hastily, he has the peculiar advantages of neither mode. His notes are hurried up without that weighing, sifting process which alone makes written sermons tolerable; yet they hinder mental and emotional freedom more than if they were carefully studied. His sermon has all the defects to which extempore discourse is liable, unfinished thought, clumsy expression, bad arrangement, without the vivacity and freedom which redeem those defects. To enable a man to do his best in the construction of a sermon, he must have time to study his subject carefully, lay his plans deliberately, and work until he feels that it is done. The itinerancy gives time to do this, and therefore has an advantage over the other system.

We know that, under every plan of ministerial labor, the hireling who careth not for the sheep will do his work with a slack hand. In the settled ministry, as it is called, he will put new texts at the head of old manuscripts, or preach as his own the sermons of better men. In the itinerancy he will repeat the same sermons, without addition or improvement, in each place, as the street musician grinds over before each house all the tunes that his organ can play. Still it is a positive excellence of our system that it permits the minister to spend much labor on a comparatively small number of discourses.

And yet, when we look at it, there is enough to be done to rouse the holy ambition and task the power of any man, however gifted. To preach to the same congregation three years, creditably and usefully, requires three hundred sermons. The

strength of most men's ministry, however learned and able, could be given in a much smaller number. Few men take a wider range of topics, or treat them more successfully, than did John Wesley; and his published discourses give, doubtless, not merely an idea of the style in which he preached, but the substance, the very pith and marrow of his ministry. Yet his two volumes contain only one hundred and forty sermons. The published sermons of Richard Watson, one of the mightiest men of the present century, number only one hundred and twenty-three. The volumes of Dr. Edward Payson, a very prince in Israel, contain ninety-six discourses only, selected from the manuscripts which accumulated during twenty years' labor in the same congregation. When Dr. J. A. Alexander, of Princeton, died, it was deemed expedient to publish but forty-three of his sermons. Dr. Dwight, a man of learning and ability, labored for years preparing a series of discourses that should discuss the whole system of theology with a good degree of minuteness and thoroughness, yet one hundred and seventy-three sermons complete the work. Some men of transcendent power seem to have done their work with a very small number of sermons. George Whitefield was the wonder of the last century, and the discourses upon which he relied were twenty-seven in number, some of which he repeated on as many as sixty different occasions. Dr. Bascom was a marvel of pulpit eloquence and power, yet his principal sermons, as selected by himself, are twelve in number; and these, he assures us, he had been elaborating and preaching twenty-five years. Where is the minister whose literary executors deemed worthy of publication a sufficient number of his sermons to supply a modern pulpit three years? We know that ministers who lived long and wrought hard with their pens, have left behind them whole bales of manuscripts; but a comparatively small number of these embody the substance of the entire mass. The same themes are of necessity discussed over and over again; every idea of importance is repeatedly set forth in its appropriate place, and favorite expressions constantly recur. Where a minister has written a thousand sermons, it is safe to say that two thirds of them are mere repetitions and dilutions of the rest; and could the whole time spent in penning the thousand have been devoted

to the preparation of one third the number, the work would have been done infinitely better. We count it one of the excellencies of our system that it gives time for thorough preparation for the pulpit. Assigning the minister a new field of labor at stated intervals, it makes all his strength available, puts back into the quiver every arrow that he has shot, and bids him shoot it again with new skill and force. By rendering one department of his duty less burdensome, it leaves him more time and energy for others. It gives more opportunity for general reading and for pastoral visiting, and enables him to look after all the interests of the Church. If any lover of ease takes advantage of the itinerancy to live an idle, careless life, belittling mind and soul where he should be growing daily, the woe belongs to him, not to the system which he abuses to his own undoing. Surely no ministers have a better opportunity than ours to gather the materials of effective service.

4. The itinerancy is conducive to health and long life.

The vital forces of a minister settled for many years over the same congregation are subjected to a fearful strain. He must write, write, write. The demand for the weekly sermon is as peremptory and as remorseless as the cry of the horse-leech's daughters. To write one thoroughly studied sermon a week for a series of years tries the strongest constitution, as facts, numerous and indisputable, attest. Many "sigh by reason of the bondage," like Israel under the task-masters of Pharaoh, and not a few break down under the burden. And the very man whose sensitive nature best fits him to attract and interest the multitude, the man whose pulses leap, and whose mind and soul glow with fervor as the argument or the appeal proceeds, lighting the same flame in the heart of the hearer, is the one to whom this strain of never-ending preparation is most painful and most dangerous. The country pastors are safest. They have fewer excitements; Church rivalries are not so pressing; the demands made upon them in the pulpit and out of it are not so numerous. They enjoy purer air, more sunshine, and have better habits of living. But look at the pastors settled over large city congregations. Every third man is a habitual invalid. The weekly sermon, which must be prepared at all hazards, is the incubus

that rests upon them, the vampyre which is draining their veins.

Many a good and able man, gifted with every element of ministerial efficiency in the various denominations around us, would be more useful, more happy, and live longer, if he could be quietly and honorably transferred to a new field of labor. The change would renew his youth like the eagle's. It would remove the weight which now presses upon brain and heart. It would render available once more the labors of the past—the sermons wrought out with great care and fervent supplication for divine aid, which he has preached with acceptance and effect, but which are useless to him now, because he stands in terror of the accusation of having given up study and ceased to write. So he toils on at his desk, with feeble pulse and weary, leaden brain, while he knows that among his papers are the notes of scores of sermons far more likely to impress and move his people than any which, in his jaded condition, he can now produce. Give him a new field, honorably, pleasantly, without the shame of a rupture with the Church which he now serves, or the agonies of candidating for another, and he becomes a new man in soul, body, and spirit. He feels the stimulus of a new auditory when his eye falls upon strange faces, where he is to win new friends and, by the grace of God, new stars for his crown. His body feels the relief; and with his returning physical vigor he prepares, like a well-instructed scribe, to "bring forth out of his treasure things new and old." The Church, too, will feel the stirring power of new ideas, new argument and illustration, new appeals to reason and conscience, new modes of address, and both minister and people go forth to spiritual battle with fresh courage and strength.

5. The itinerancy has advantages over other modes of distributing ministerial labor, in that it provides the means of effecting necessary changes quietly and without doing injury to either minister or people.

These changes are sometimes expedient on the score of health; sometimes because of a want of adaptation; sometimes because of outward circumstances, which get awry and cannot be straightened. As we have seen, it is a great advantage to the people to be able to secure new arrangements

without open rupture and public debate. We need not occupy space in showing that it also works to the advantage of the minister.

Such are some of the excellencies and defects of the itinerant system, as they seem to us. We have tried to discuss the subject fairly, extenuating nothing which weighs against our system, nor setting down aught in malice against others. There remains as yet unnoticed one point of vital importance, in reference to which we cannot well in this paper do more than state our convictions and hint our reasons. Holding firmly to the itinerant principle, believing it to be good, wise, and efficient, we doubt whether in our case two important elements of strength are adjusted to each other in due proportion, as the laws of the Church now stand. Slowness and deadness on the one hand, and instability on the other, are the dangers that beset the Church of God, the Scylla and Charybdis of the waters which we navigate. The coming of a new pastor rouses the Church and community, and attracts new hearers. His personal acquaintance with the people, his knowledge of their spiritual state, and their respect and friendship for him, are among the instrumentalities which consolidate the Church, and bind men to their duty. The coming of the new messenger tends to attract; his remaining for a time tends to make permanent the results of his ministry. The Church whose forces are rightly adjusted will possess in a good degree both elements of strength. The Methodist Episcopal Church has the elements which give force and effect in rousing the community and attracting hearers; but has she in an equal degree the elements of solid strength and stability? Is she as powerful to hold as she is to reach? We think not. We appeal to our statistics for evidence.

In the year 1856 there were 800,327 souls, members and probationers, in our fold. Since that date nearly 1,000,000 of probationers have been reported. About 90,000 deaths have also been reported. Had there been no losses except by death, we would this day have numbered about 1,700,000 members and probationers, whereas the numbers reported in 1864 are only 928,320. In eight years three quarters of a million of names strangely disappear from our Church records. At the General Conference of 1864 the bishops reported a

decrease of 50,951 during the previous four years, and accounted for it on the ground that the war had broken up Churches and scattered societies over all the area where raged the battle. Yet during those same years more than 100,000 accessions were annually reported. How shall we explain this fearful depletion? Some other denominations, the Congregationalists for instance, in publishing their statistics report in a separate column the members who have removed their residence, and yet have not formally transferred their membership. These form a considerable item in the aggregate, and so they would in our Church were we to number them; still, after due allowance thus made for non-resident members, there remains a vast multitude not accounted for, save on the ground that they are cases of religious failure. The fact is appalling. It calls for the deep and prayerful scrutiny of every lover of Zion. It is only too apparent that instability is the weakness, the sin, the shame of our Church. Yet we do not believe that the grace of God is any less powerful with us, or human nature any worse than with others.

We cannot resist the conviction that our forces are not well adjusted. We are powerful to attract and weak to hold. We cast the net on the right side of the ship and inclose a multitude of fishes, but the net breaks. We believe that the recent lengthening of the pastoral term will tend to give us stability, and that this tendency would have been stronger if the term had been extended to five years instead of three.

The great problem to which the most accurate observers and the closest thinkers of our Church should apply themselves, is to find some remedy for this mighty evil, if there be any remedy within the reach of human hands. Divine power is indeed the source of all true religious life, both in its beginning and its continuance; nevertheless we are bound so to adjust our plans of action to the divine methods that we may not "frustrate the grace of God."

## Art. IV.—LIFE AND MARTYRDOM OF STEPHEN.

It is very natural that our attention, while seldom dwelling upon the martyrdom of the other disciples and early Christians, except for a specific purpose, should be fixed especially upon that of Stephen, succeeding so soon the death of Christ, so early in his Christian ministry, and being with the attending circumstances the only prominent event recorded of his life. Usually, therefore, we speak of Stephen as the first martyr and leave his story there, without pausing to note the significant importance of his earnest Christian life with its sad and sudden termination. But such a life cannot be so short nor closed so suddenly as not to enthrone itself among the active and eternal moral forces of the world. The seed dropped from the hand of a faithful servant of truth in the space of an hour will be springing up and bearing fruit ages hence, while he is slumbering in the tomb. It may be a little leaven, but it shall add its force in leavening the whole lump.

### THE APPOINTMENT OF STEPHEN AS ARCHDEACON OF JERUSALEM.

The first notice we have of Stephen is his appointment as chief steward or deacon in the distribution of food and money to the destitute Christians of Jerusalem. The establishment of this board of stewards was an outgrowth, we may say a necessary outgrowth, of the circumstances of the times and the genius of Christianity. For many of the Jews of Palestine were extremely poor, and of this class very many became Christians. The cry then was, as now, "The poor ye have always with you." In other cases the odium of bearing the Christian name undermined the livelihood of those dependent upon their labor for support, and thus extensive almsgiving on the part of the wealthy became necessary. It is a fact recorded of the apostolic Church, that one of its chief characteristics was its bountiful charities. The work of making these distributions seems to have been left at first, under a general supervision of the disciples, to Jews of Hebrew descent who were either careless, or purposely less attentive to those who spake the Greek language than to those of their own dialect.

This led to the following complaint: "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration." The term widows is here put by a figure of speech for all poor and needy persons. The apostles listened attentively to the statement of these grievances, and, though willing to do everything in their power, deemed it expedient to inform the complainants that they themselves could not attend to such work, for the ministration of the word and prayer was their peculiar mission.

The apostles did not build church edifices; they were not universal business agents, neither voluntarily, nor did they allow such offices to be forced upon them. They preached to the poor as well as the rich, to the rich as well as the poor, and for this they prepared themselves; few public teachers have been better prepared. They preached at home and abroad; at Athens and at Rome; in Britain and in Spain; everywhere healing the sick that were brought unto them; but the charitable ministrations to the poor and the business affairs of the Church were placed in other hands.

Complaint is sometimes made that the ministry of the present time is not apostolic, because a careful pulpit preparation, in many instances, is made the first business of the preacher. Possibly, in other respects, the modern ministry falls short of the primitive standard, but in this respect it is thoroughly apostolic. If space were allowed in this article it would be easy to show, on the other hand, that a Church modeled after the apostolic plan would relieve the ministry, instead of imposing duties upon it that could be performed equally well by the laity. It would not call upon a minister to superintend the erection of its edifices, make him chairman of all business committees, nor leave to him almost exclusively the care of the poor and the sick. Religion and religious duties, in such a Church, would not be paid for with money; Christians would not live by proxy, nor go to heaven by proxy, but live as they ought and go there themselves. The apostles, to relieve themselves entirely from these duties, which properly belonged to others, that they might give themselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the word, and to make a proper division of labor, and also to provide carefully against future partiality,

recommend the appointment of seven men to take the entire charge of this business, from the defective performance of which complaints had arisen. Their first choice was Stephen who was thus constituted president or chairman of the board. The qualifications required for this office were of a high order, and Stephen is especially commended and singled out from among the seven. There is a reiteration of emphatic and almost superlative phrases used respecting him. His name and appointment would indicate that he was a Hellenistic Jew, speaking the Greek language, and familiar also with the Hebrew. He was very likely a convert of St. Peter's on the day of Pentecost; and his character, as set before us in the Acts, is the happiest evidence of the soundness of his conversion. The Fathers speak of him as a man of extensive learning; which is also indicated in his speech before the Sanhedrim, and in the skill and power with which he met and overthrew his opponents in the synagogues of the city. "In fact," says Howson, "by his peculiar power he shot far ahead of his six companions and far above his peculiar office." He was a leading man among the disciples even, and in some respects superior to any of them. And had he lived he would undoubtedly soon have been appointed a regular preacher, relieved of his duties as local deacon, and have been numbered among the apostles.

### STEPHEN BEFORE THE HELLENISTIC SYNAGOGUE.

There was in Jerusalem at this time a synagogue of learned foreigners, called the synagogue of "The Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia." Stephen by his education and nationality was a prominent member of this body, and retained his connection with it even after his conversion. Synagogues in Jerusalem were then numerous, distinguished, like different sects of modern Christians, by the peculiar views held. The early Christian Church, therefore, might, without impropriety, have been called the Galilean synagogue; for the disciples at first, following the example of Christ, did not separate themselves from the Jewish nation, the public festivals, nor from the temple worship. The separation and development were gradual, and find illustration in the formation of our own Church. Wesley and his followers, while organizing Methodism, very

properly, for a time, retained their connection with the established Church of England. The great changes and developments that are ever taking place under the providence of God in the natural and moral world are gradual, never violent. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." But the leaders and defenders of such progressive movements invariably find that persecution or martyrdom lie in their pathway. The emblem of truth and progress is a hero under arms, and their voice is Christ's—"I come not to send peace on earth, but a sword." The devotion and zeal of Stephen would not allow him to remain silent as he met from time to time with these learned men of Alexandria. He took a position which cost him his repose; the sword, not the pruning-knife, had been chosen. Before these men he fearlessly stated his peculiar views, and undoubtedly urged their observance upon his opponents. There was at this time a young man in the city bearing the name "Saul of Tarsus." He was between twenty-five and thirty years of age, and by his birth and education was a member, with Stephen, of the Hellenistic synagogue. From his thorough education, earnest zeal, and the prominent part he took in the martyrdom of Stephen, we must infer that he was one of the first and most noted among the opponents of this bold advocate of Christianity, and newly appointed agent of the Church. We can easily imagine the scene in the synagogue as these two young men of nearly the same age, of apparently equal zeal and erudition, met, the one contending with all his devotion for the new faith, the other with all his energy for the faith of the fathers; the one just from the college of Gamaliel, the other inspired by the Holy Ghost. But Stephen on the side of truth was more than a match for Saul and his companions. Their ingenuity was exhausted in vain attempts to overthrow him. They stood abashed and silent in the presence of this single-handed preacher of truth. One, if on the side of truth, can conquer a thousand; and two put ten thousand to flight, if they are on the side of error. Strength is not with the majority unless the majority are right. The inspired writer says of Stephen, "And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake." As is not unusual, failing in fair debate, his enemies

determined to destroy by violent means where they could not vanquish by argument. They were urged to this course both from mortification at the results of the contest, upon which they had entered with full confidence of victory, and from a blind zeal in supporting the law and rights of Moses, which they thought had been invaded. To accomplish their purpose they suborned men, as the Pharisees had done in their persecutions of Christ, to falsify what had been said in order to bring Stephen before the Jewish Sanhedrim. He is charged with speaking blasphemous words against the holy place and the law. There were apparent grounds for this charge; at least, what Stephen had said might be so construed as to furnish the ground of the accusations brought against him. Witnesses for this purpose were easily found.

Many will misconstrue, but few have the courage to fabricate an absolute falsehood. He is a bold man who will make a direct charge in daylight; a coward may dare to make a side thrust at midnight. Stephen had said that the worship of God was not local, but universal. This was enough to create the charge of blasphemy. For, if worship is universal, it is not confined to the temple. The temple is thus brought into disrepute; he has therefore spoken against it, and is a blasphemer and must be condemned. How easily the truth can be warped, till it is as pernicious as direct falsehood.

### STEPHEN BEFORE THE JEWISH SANHEDRIM.

The steps by which Stephen is brought before the Sanhedrim are natural. His learning and connection with the Hellenistic synagogue rendered him conspicuous; the advocacy of his peculiar views rendered him obnoxious. His enemies, unable to answer him in fair debate, and in order to crush his influence, bring him before the Sanhedrim, which, like the Areopagus at Athens, is represented "as the highest and most awful court of adjudication, especially in matters pertaining to religion." This council were assembled in solemn and formal state; partly within and partly without the temple court. The president sat in the less sacred portion, and around him in a semicircle were the rest of the seventy judges. Before this judicial body, and confronted by his accusers, Stephen was arraigned to answer for his life on charge of blasphemy. He

was calm and collected; there were no symptoms of perturbation, no trembling for his life, no recourse to tears, no sullen submission to his fate. Their white beards, their robes of office, and their sentence of death cannot alarm this moral hero. They inspire him. The eyes of all were fixed upon his countenance, which glowed under their gaze with a radiance that was supernatural. In the beautiful Jewish expression of Scripture, "They saw his face as it had been the face of an angel." As they look upon this sign of God's approval, his judges ought to have remembered the glowing face of him who had given the law, and have trembled. But their thoughts were so occupied with the fading glories of their theocracy, and with the supposed insult uttered against their temple, that they did not recognize in the spectacle before them the evidence that henceforth the Christian soul is to be the living sanctuary of God, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, whose worship is dedicated to Jehovah, not in this mountain or that, but throughout the earth. Eyes they have, but they see not, and proceed with the trial. The charges were preferred, and the judicial question to which the accused was required to plead was put by the president: "Are these things so?" In his reply, Stephen is expected to deny the charges or to make satisfactory explanations and confessions. His speech, however, answers to this only in part and indirectly. He traveled historically in his argument through all the important events of the Jewish economy; from Abraham to Joseph, from Joseph to Moses, from Moses to David and Solomon. He declared that God's blessing rested upon the faith of Abraham, though a stranger in the land of promise; upon the piety of Joseph, though an exile and slave in Egypt; on the devotion of Moses, though in the desert of Sinai: and these were all without a temple. As he reaches this point in his argument his soul seems to take fire with his subject. He forgets himself and the charges upon which is to follow his condemnation; he appears more anxious to save his audience than to procure his own pardon; and as he raises his heroic voice in the defense of truth it echoes through the council-hall, reaffirming the neglected theory of the universal worship of God, the very ground of his previous offense, and for which he is now on trial. "Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as

saith the prophet. Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things?"

At this point there is an abrupt turn in his speech. It is possible that he had followed the argument as far as he intended, or it is possible that he intended to carry it to greater length, but was interrupted by some disturbance among the audience. The character of the argument will allow of either supposition. Whatever was his motive, it is clearly evident that he saw his doom was already sealed. And his innocence, his faith, his hope of immortality gave him power to seize upon the few remaining moments to tell his audience some of the most wholesome though the most unwelcome truths that could be uttered. Is his situation critical? Down he flings another and heavier sword into the scale already trembling against him. "God offers to every mind its choice," says Emerson, "between truth and repose. Take which you please; you cannot have both; between these, as a pendulum, man oscillates." The goal of Stephen's march was not to save his life, nor to gain the favor of his judges and the repose of this life, but to reach an infinite heaven, an indubitable goal for every such spirit. Death he welcomed, since it must come, but welcomes it in the defense of truth, sword in hand. Life is nothing, death is nothing, to such men. They have already entered upon another life. The conduct of Stephen before the Sanhedrim is so like that of Jerome of Prague before the Bohemian Council in 1416 that we may pause to institute a comparison. Before his execution Jerome was allowed a public defense. From long confinement he was enfeebled, which was especially apparent in the introduction of his speech; but as he warmed with his subject, "He fell into a strain of the most dazzling eloquence," says Neander. He brought up, one after another, those men who, among Pagans, Jews, and Christians, had fallen victims to false accusations. Socrates, Seneca, John the Baptist, Stephen, and John Huss, were enumerated in the catalogue. Jerome knew that the mention of that last name would infuriate his judges, because, for following Huss, he was now on trial. But to him life was nothing. To defend that man whom his judges had

executed, was his mission, and dearer to him than life. At this point *he* was interrupted, and turning to his judges he exclaimed, "I trust in God, my Creator, that one day, after this life, ye shall see Jerome preceding you to judgment, where you must answer for your conduct." "This last sentence," says the historian, "was Jerome's death-warrant." What Arminian, even, does not love the ring and scope of those majestic words "ordained of God" when witnessing such displays of fierceless daring in the defense of truth? They have a meaning that rises far above the ordinary Calvinistic idea, blending the awful will-power of man with the omnipotence of God. "*I move*, but under God's direction," seems to be the language of the great martyrs, prophets, and defenders of truth throughout history. Duty was theirs; the risk belonged to God. Listen to their language: "If you call me impious because of my hostility to your gods," said Ignatius to the Emperor Trajan, "I own the charge;" and for this he was thrown to the wild beasts of the amphitheater. When Cyprian was brought before the pro-consul of Carthage he was asked, "Are you Thascius Cyprian?" "I am." "Are you he whom the Christians call their bishop?" "I am." "Our princes have ordered you to worship the gods." "That I shall not do." And for this he was beheaded. When Polycarp was brought to Rome the pro-consul said, "Curse Christ and I release you." "For six and eighty years have I served him," the old man replied, "and he has done me nothing but good. Can I curse him? I tell you frankly, I am a Christian." And for this he was led to the stake. Zwingle, before the Great Council at Zurich, on charges of being a "heretic, seducer, and a rebellious man," exclaimed: "Here, then, I stand in God's name; I acknowledge no authority but that of the Gospel." Followed by Luther, before the Diet of Worms, when he exclaimed, "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise." I cannot do otherwise! How sublime is such language in the lips of such men! This was the sentiment which was stamped upon every act and word of Stephen as he stood before the Jewish Sanhedrim. And how had it been otherwise with the world if these great heroes and martyrs had moved as if they thought they could have done otherwise than stand by the truth at all hazards? Chains would have been where free-

dom now is, and darkness where there is light. Thank God that some men are bold enough to answer to their name when called! Sublime election! Many are called, but few are worthy of being chosen for this high service of God on earth. Stephen fearlessly told the council and the Jews what he thought of them. This is his cutting language: "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers."

At this announcement "they were cut to the heart and gnashed on him with their teeth." But Stephen is unmoved by this expression of rage. He stood like a rock in the midst of the ocean, upon which the tempests blew and the waves dashed in vain. His was the composure of the evening sky, toward which a thousand rockets are hurled, but burst before they reach their mark. In his eye there was the gleaming of the rarest genius and the Holy Ghost, which like the lightning of God, glancing athwart the clouds, mocks the feeble fireworks of mortals beneath. And thus Stephen calmly faces his infuriated and haughty judges. Nothing on earth surpasses the moral grandeur of those scenes in which one man alone, for the sake of truth, stands opposed to the many. Sublimer than the march of the grandest army beneath whose tread the earth has trembled. Such was Elijah as he confronted nine hundred priests of Baal and an enraged king on Mount Carmel. Such was John Huss as he stood before the Bohemian Council, alone. Such, Luther before the Diet of Worms. Such the defender of our own faith, Episcopius before the Synod of Dort. And such was another martyr whose name will live when ours are forgotten. The scene was under a clear December Virginian sky: on the one side a gallows and a thousand bayonets, on the other the serene brow of that calm old man, John Brown, as he stoops to kiss the sable forehead of the child of a forlorn race. But he was illegal! Yes, and so were Elijah, and Stephen, and Huss, and Luther illegal; and so is every hero who dares in God's service to take a step in advance of his age.

Stephen, while awaiting the issue of his illegality, calmly

lifts his eyes to heaven, and the scene presented is no longer in the council-hall at Jerusalem, for he is a citizen of another world. "And he saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God." Standing! Elsewhere if Christ is spoken of in his glorified state, he is said to be not standing, but seated at the right hand of the Father. Here, alone, he is represented as standing. As Chrysostom beautifully clothes the thought, the Saviour could no longer sit, but had risen from his throne and was watching anxiously the faith and endurance of his disciple, and waiting to welcome him to the courts of heaven, as a judge rises in an earthly court, but only to welcome the most distinguished visitors. Could an angel receive greater honor? But, in the court-room, a scene of the wildest confusion followed this announcement. The passions of the Sanhedrim were wound up to the highest pitch. Gamaliel, if he had been disposed, could not now restrain their fury. They forbear no longer; they stop not to take the vote. That Christ is exalted was false, and in Stephen's lips was found a double blasphemy. They cry out with a loud voice, which breaks into a confused yell of madness; they clap their hands to their ears to shut out the blasphemy; they spring upon him with the fury of hungry wolves impatient for blood, and would have torn him to pieces on the spot had it not been that the law forbade execution to take place within the city walls. They must not forget themselves and become *illegal*, and they bore him without the gates of the city.

### THE DEATH OF STEPHEN.

It seems singular that the world has punished alike its noblest benefactors and its bitterest foes. Disinterested devotion to the public good seems ever to have been regarded as one of the capital crimes of society. Release Barabbas and crucify the benefactor is the cry of history. Was not Socrates the friend of Athens? But Athens murdered Socrates. Did not Cicero live for and love Rome as he did his own life? But Rome murdered Cicero. Were not Huss and Jerome friends to the Bohemians? But the Bohemians murdered Huss and Jerome. Who were truer friends to England than Latimer and Ridley? But England murdered Latimer and Ridley. And he whose heart could feel and lips express

the noble sentiment, "With malice toward none, with charity toward all," in our own day, pays the same penalty for his philanthropy. "What one of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted?" was the significant question of Stephen. If we have not already, we shall learn that to be a signal friend to mankind is almost, if not quite, as dangerous as to be a signal enemy. He that will save others cannot save himself.

Was Stephen a criminal, guilty of some appalling crime, that he was thus hurried out of the city, contrary to justice? Was he an enemy to Jerusalem and a traitor to its interests, that the thoughtless crowd were clapping their hands and crying, "good!" as they heard of his condemnation? He had distributed food to the poor, he had labored for them with untiring zeal, he had visited sick people and healed them, he had warned his countrymen and the Jews of danger, and urged upon them the higher and spiritual worship of Jehovah. If these are crimes, he is guilty; if this is treason, he was a traitor. For no other crimes than these is he to die. O ungrateful city! O misguided people!

There were two routes from the hall to the place designated for the execution. The crowd part in order to facilitate their egress, for there was great and general excitement in Jerusalem. "The people and the elders and the scribes" had been stirred up by the members of the influential Hellenistic synagogue. A portion pass out at the northern and a portion at the eastern gate. The party having the prisoner in charge leave by the northern, since called St. Stephen's gate; then, turning to the right, pass round the northeast angle of the wall, where they were joined again by those who had left the city from the eastern gate, and together they descend somewhere about the rocky edges of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, where the Mount of Olives quietly looked down upon the scene of death, and here the pure and noble-minded martyr was murdered.

Those who took the lead in this wild and terrible transaction were the witnesses who had misreported or misinterpreted the words of the prisoner. According to an eastern custom, before any violent exercise, and on this occasion for the sake of facility in the dreadful task of stoning, they stripped themselves of their garments. One of the prominent leaders on such occasions was deputed, by custom, to signify his assent to

the act by taking the clothes of the witnesses into his custody and standing over them while the bloody work went on. The choice in the present instance was Saul of Tarsus, the zealous opponent of Stephen in the Alexandrian synagogue. The preliminaries of the execution were thus arranged and completed; the witnesses had taken their stations; Stephen is nerved, or rather inspired for the shock; the people were in position, and waiting in breathless silence, and we suppose there was silence also in heaven. The signal is given, and the first volley of stones glide instantly from perhaps a score of hands, crashing against the martyr, who lifts his voice in prayer to heaven, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" which has since been the repeated cry of those who for the same cause have perished at the stake or fallen by the sword.

The second and third volleys are hurled in quick succession against his already agonized body, and fell him to the earth, and one long, piercing cry escaped his dying lips, "Lay not this sin to their charge!" A fitting conclusion to such a life; and in spirit it was the same prayer that fell only a few months before from divine lips for the same murderers. The inspired narrator closes the scene in the brief but touching language, "He fell asleep!" The expression is happily chosen; tired and exhausted nature seeks repose; that is all, and that is enough.

### THE RESULTS OF STEPHEN'S MARTYRDOM AND ITS LESSON.

The crowd now gather about the corpse. Women and children steal a hasty glance and hurry back to the city. Enemies are exultant, friends are sad, and many in the throng look thoughtfully upon the scene and retire to think or to talk of the events of the day, feeling, indeed, that they had fallen on troublous times. And revelation closes its history of Stephen in the brief but suggestive language, "Devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him."

The evening shadows fell upon the Valley of Jehoshaphat and drew their mantle over the scene of that day's tragedy. But there were other and darker shadows gathering about the infant Church in Jerusalem, now struggling for its life. To the disciples this night was scarcely less foreboding of evil than the night that had succeeded the death of their divine Master. The disciples felt that they had lost a friend that could not be

spared. One of the ablest, perhaps at that time *the* ablest leader in the Church had fallen. Less entangled in the prejudices of the Hebrew nationality, on account of his foreign birth and grasp of mind, he had a clearer view of the genius of Christianity and its freedom from local restraints than any other disciple of the Saviour. In erudition, fervent zeal, moral heroism; as an orator, rhetorician, and advocate, he cannot be regarded inferior even to the Apostle Paul, who in reality, in the apostleship of the Gentiles, became the successor of Stephen. For this he was nobly fitted, but the very last who could be expected to succeed the martyr, being his bitterest enemy, and one of the principal actors amid the scenes of the martyrdom. "The Church," as St. Augustine affirms, "owes Paul to the prayer and death of Stephen." Such are the lessons and results of Stephen's martyrdom, teaching us that bright spots may be found even upon the darkest page of the world's history, and that the Church will be provided for against any and all exigencies. The importance of Stephen's career, and the marked characteristics that appear in the brief account given of him, may be summed up under the following heads:

1. He was the first great Christian polemic and ecclesiastic, displaying remarkable ability before the synagogue and Sanhedrim, and also possessing great executive ability in the management of the finances and other business of the Church. 2. He was the first Christian martyr—the proto-martyr. That is, the first, after the establishment of the Christian Church, who witnessed to the truth by a painful and violent death. 3. There was a striking similarity between Stephen and the apostle Paul. They were more alike than any other two members of the early Christian Church of which we have any account. This may be seen in their common nationality, their learning, and in the striking resemblance of their polemics, their faith, their zeal, their heroism, and their devotion to the truth. 4. And lastly, he was the forerunner of Paul, and in a higher sense than merely being before him in point of time. While Paul was contending with Stephen, as he listened to him before the synagogue, and to his speech before the Sanhedrim, he learned some of the mightiest arguments that he afterward employed with convincing power before strangers and kings. The denunciation against local worship, the importance

attached to the spiritual side of Jewish history, the emptiness of formal ceremonies, were thoughts not originated by Paul, but heard from the lips of Stephen on the day of his trial. When Paul was before the synagogue at Antioch, he secured the attention of the Jews by adopting the historical method, precisely as Stephen had done before the Sanhedrim. Stephen, in his speech, asserted his attachment to the principles of the Mosaic religion. Paul saw the truthfulness and advantages of this, and adopted the same course with great effect before King Agrippa. Stephen spoke plainly of the temple and the nature of the true worship of Jehovah. Paul saw the strength and beauty of this thought and followed it in his speech at Athens. We would not argue from these facts that Paul was a mere copyist, but that Stephen was strictly his predecessor and one of his ablest instructors.

## Art. V.—THE 1260 YEARS OF ANTICHRIST.

The chronology of the Apocalypse is the vexed question of unfulfilled prophecy. The chief difficulty of explaining and applying prophetic symbols would be removed if we could identify their archetypes in the facts of history; and this again would be more easily accomplished if we could settle the dates and periods of the Apocalypse in their true order. An important step is gained by settling the true scope and scheme of the book itself. Indeed, till this be done we may say of the writer, "he walks on in darkness." We have not space here even to enumerate the various theories, but must content ourselves by simply stating our own, which is, that the design of the book of Revelation is to sketch an outline of the history of the Church from the time of John down to the final judgment day—giving her struggles, her sufferings, her triumphs, her final success and glorious reward, together with the bloody type and the everlasting doom of her enemies.

As one object of prophecy is to "forewarn and forearm the Church," it has ever been the method of Divine Wisdom to keep before the eye of faith and "the mind that hath wis-

dom" some intimations of the providential future relating to the holy seed, including with greater or less clearness, a description, not only of the more important facts which were to transpire, but some hints also as to time. Thus the bondage of the Hebrews in Egypt and Babylon, the first advent of Christ, the destruction of Jerusalem, with numerous other events, are examples of this kind. Inquiry, therefore, into the providential future of the Church is both relevant and important when reverently and discreetly made by the light of prophecy and the facts of history. As to time, different methods of notation are adopted in Scripture. The simplest is to put down the period in solar years. But, except in a few instances, chiefly the "four hundred years'" captivity of the Hebrews in Egypt, (Gen. xv, 13,) and their "seventy years'" captivity in Babylon, (Jer. xxv, 11, 12,) there is scarcely a mention made of solar time for the measurement of prophetic cycles. Another mode, of greater frequency, is by symbolic time, or where a lesser period is put for a greater, as a day for a year, a week for seven years, a month for thirty years, or a year of three hundred and sixty days for three hundred and sixty years. Thus, the "seventy weeks" of Daniel (chap. ix, 24) are 70 weeks × 7=490 years. The "forty-two months" of John (Rev. xi, 2) are 42×30=1260 years—always reckoning in symbolic time 30 days to a month. So, also, the "time, times, and a half time," or "time, times, and the dividing of time," (Dan. vii, 25; Rev. xii, 14,) are a year, two years, and a half year, which, reckoning 360 days to a year, and counting each day as the symbol of a year, (as in Ezek. iv, 6,) make 1260 years. The "thousand two hundred and threescore days" (Rev. xi, 3) are, in like manner, 1260 years.

Two other methods are resorted to, and are by far the more common, whereby to give a clue to the question of time, namely: the ORDER OF EVENTS, and the NATURE and DESCRIPTIVE CIRCUMSTANCES of events. These are brought out with great prominence in the Apocalypse; the former only giving a general idea of time prior to the event, but both being of indispensable value in connection with other methods. For instance: where events are described serially, it is obvious that if the first, or any subsequent link of the series, can be identified in history, it is easy to trace the connection progress-

irely or regressively, as the case may be; particularly if, midway of this chain, an important chronological link becomes indisputably recognizable, a large gain is made toward the unfolding of the subsequent periods. Now, such a recognizable link is found in the 1260 years of Antichrist. We are guided in our searchings after this important date by the frequent notations of symbolic time, by the general law of serial order and relation, and by the light of descriptive circumstances. To fix the date of this period has been a focal point to which criticism and investigation have been directed with no common zeal and diligence. If this can be done, the present status of the Church can be clearly defined, and its more immediate future forestalled.

The period of the reign of Antichrist, including an account of his downfall, has received greater formality and fullness of description, and a bolder outline of chronological limitation, than any period of the Apocalyptic visions, filling one third the entire book of Revelation. The struggles of the Church with pagan Rome, with the northern barbarians who disrupted the Western empire, together with the overflowing scourge of the Mohammedans, embracing the periods of the entire first six seals, and six of the trumpet periods under the seventh seal, were dismissed, in less than half the space, in the four preceding chapters. The tenth chapter of Revelation marks an interval in the prophecy, and must be regarded as a formal prelude to the grand and terrific cycle which was to follow. It was the moment of a solemn announcement. The most terrible enemy the Church would ever be called to grapple with now presented himself. When Daniel had beheld him in the remote distance, "he was grieved in his spirit, the visions of his head troubled him," and "his countenance was changed." (Dan. vii, 15, 28.) The period was to be long, and the conflicts of the Church mighty; and now, lest it should be inferred that because the seventh seal had been opened, and six of the trumpet periods under that seal already passed, the end of the Church's warfare had come and the time of her sufferings over, a "mighty angel" descended from heaven, and with one foot upon the sea and the other upon the earth, and with his hand lifted toward heaven, "swore by him that liveth for ever and ever, *ὁτι χρονος ουκ ἐστι ἐτι, that*

*the time is not yet*, but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, *when he shall sound*,* the mystery of God should be finished." Immediately after this prologue contained in the tenth chapter, follow various independent representations of this antichristian power, its nature, its enormous expansion, its malignant persecutions of the faithful, its corruptions and blasphemy, and its everlasting downfall. From the beginning of the tenth chapter to the eleventh verse of the nineteenth chapter, the descriptions are entirely engrossed with the history and doom of Antichrist, and events connected therewith. After the downfall of Antichrist the thread of the prophetic narrative is resumed only at chapter xix, 11.

As the principal object of this article is to determine the date of this antichristian period, as nearly as may be by solar measurement, we hasten to this point. In seven different places, by the varied computation of "days," "months," and "times," the years of the reign of Antichrist are put down at just 1260. (Daniel vii, 25; xii, 7; Revelation xi, 2, 3; xii, 6, 14; xiii, 5.) Is there no moral significance in this fact? Is the question of *time* a matter of simple curiosity? We think not. If, then, Antichrist is to reign 1260 years, and is then, according to the explicit statements of prophecy seven times recorded, to fall to rise no more, it is apparent that to fix the date of this period, to determine where the 1260 years begin, is to supply new matter of consolation and hope to an afflicted and struggling Church, and new motives for patient activity and perseverance.

Where, then, do the 1260 years begin? This question can be answered only by a careful attention to descriptive circumstances involving the character, form, and proportions of Antichrist. We arrive at the solution by a sort of inductive process. For instance, when all the characteristics of Antichrist, as laid down in prophecy, are brought together and submitted, then the historic power, or agency, which is found

* This is certainly the true rendering. It is well known that μελλω is often used to express simple *futurity*, as in Matthew xi, 14; Luke ix, 31; John xi, 51, *et al.* The angel evidently intended only to declare the time yet future when "the mystery of God should be finished," that is, God's mysterious providence toward the Church, in allowing her thus to be persecuted. The sequel shows that this "mystery of God" was not finished till late in the period of the seventh trumpet.

to embody in itself all these, and to fall within the historic order and relation of time and sequence indicated, must be assumed to be the real and historic prototype and impersonation of these prophetic symbols and delineations. In no other way could the question be solved from the nature of the case. We have not space for the details of the argument, but must generalize our statements under two heads: *the moral character and the external form* of Antichrist. It is only by its outgrowth, or external form, that we are able to trace and fix the true *chronos* of its existence.

1. The Antichrist of prophecy is an apostate Christian Church. Paul says, "The day of the Lord shall not come except there come ἡ αποστασια, THE APOSTACY first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, *who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped.*"

So also John describes the same power under the image of a "harlot," the standing symbol of an apostate, idolatrous Church. (Rev. xvii. See Ezek. xvi, xxviii.) The merchandise of mystic Babylon was in the σωματων και ψυχας ανθρωπων, "*bodies and souls of men.*" (Rev. xvii, 13.) She trafficked in the temporal and eternal interests of mankind.

2. Antichrist was to be the great persecutor of the saints, the terror of the Church. "He shall wear out the saints of the Most High," says Daniel, and shall "make war with the saints and prevail against them," "and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people." (Dan. vii, 21, 25; viii, 24.) John saw the "harlot" "drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," and in "Babylon" was found "the blood of the prophets and of saints." Rev. xvii, 6; xviii, 24. John abounds in the descriptions of Antichrist as a persecuting power.

3. Antichrist is a temporal and spiritual autocracy. Daniel says "he shall think to change times and laws," (chap. vii, 25,) a phrase which exactly denotes the absolute prerogative of God as the supreme ruler of human affairs, as the same prophet himself teaches, (chap. ii, 21:) "And he [God] changeth the times and the seasons; he removeth kings and setteth up kings." Paul says that "he [the man of sin, Antichrist,] as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii, 4.) These and such like passages

show an assumption of supremacy over human affairs, both in spiritual and temporal things, which rightfully belongs to God only.

4. Antichrist is a Roman power of a new and peculiar type, not of civic Rome, but a power Roman in its character.

5. Antichrist is a Roman power of the later period, to arise after the extinction of the empire in the West.

6. Antichrist is a political sovereignty. Daniel represents it under the symbol of a "*horn*," the established symbol of a kingdom. (Dan. vii, 8; xx, 24.) John speaks of it under the image of a "beast," and as one of the "*heads*" of the "beast," which expressly denote a kingdom or form of government. (Rev. xvii, 8–11.) It is not necessary to carry our specifications further.

Now the point of the argument lies here: at whatever period the Church is found to have taken on these several characteristics, at that period we are to look for the date of the rise of Antichrist. It is a simple search into the history of the Church for the embodied and historic prototype of the symbolic descriptions of prophecy.

1. The order of our inquiry leads us first to determine the period of the Church's apostacy. We do not ask, At what age did the Church depart from the simplicity of the apostles? but, At what period did she become so corrupt as to answer to the descriptions of prophecy relating to Antichrist, the "man of sin," the "great harlot," mystic "Babylon," the "little horn," the eighth head of the beast, (Rev. xvii, 11,) the remorseless persecutor of the saints? Three gradational stages mark the downward progress of the Church to her grand apostasy. These we shall denominate the *hierarchal period*, the *State Church period*, and the *period of the revolt of the popes from the dominion of the Eastern emperors*. During the first three centuries the Church had grown up a separate establishment from the State, and had, from various causes, developed the idea and form of a spiritual hierarchy, culminating in the Bishop of Rome. The doctrine of the absolute unity of the Church, holding guardianship of the spiritual efficacy of all the sacraments and of all channels of grace, made the doctrine of a spiritual autocracy or headship necessary, and the Bishop of Rome was designated as that head. The maxim, as old as

Cyprian, "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," was a most natural conclusion. Here, then, the foundations of a spiritual despotism were laid. The outlines of the character of the "man of sin," "sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself that he is God," were formed. It took form in the blasphemous exaltation of the spiritual office, and the merging first the Church into the hierarchy and then the hierarchy into the papacy, assuming the absolute vicegerency of Christ upon the earth, and dooming with anathema all schism, dissent, or protest. Such was the form and fashion which the Church began to take on prior to the fourth century. Innocent I., in the beginning of the fifth century, and Leo the Great, forty years later, consolidated the foundations of this new monarchy, and Gregory the Great, at the close of the sixth century, carried forward the structure to completion in all essential features. The spiritual hierarchy thus erected was the first grand step in the apostasy.

Another step was taken, in the fourth and subsequent centuries, by erecting this hierarchal establishment into a State Church. Under the Christian emperors, from the time of Constantine, the Church became a branch of the civil polity. The Church had grown up a separate establishment hitherto, and as it operated from the force and genius of the Christian life and doctrine, it antagonized directly not only with paganism as a religious institution, but with the genius of the Roman polity as an offspring of pagan intellect and superstition. It became obvious, therefore, that either the empire must overcome Christianity or Christianity would revolutionize the empire, or they must unite upon some middle ground of compromise. This last device was adopted by Constantine, and a State Church arose. But by exalting the Church in her wealth and external power and privilege, through this union, she became, in an inverse proportion, debased and corrupted spiritually, and the unholy alliance became the second grand step in her great apostasy. As the spiritual hierarchy had been developed and advocated by Cyprian, so the State Church theory became the beau ideal of Church perfection with Augustine; and the idea and model which her writers and learned men supplied, her secularized clergy reduced to form and hardened into law, and enforced as dogma, as fast as the prog-

ress of events would allow. During the period of this State Church existence, however, the Bishop of Rome and the whole Church were overshadowed by the authority of the Romano-Byzantine emperors, and never reached, and in the nature of the case never could reach, the full height and proportions of that antichristian prototype which filled the eye and gave birth to the symbolism of prophecy. While Rome remained subject to the Eastern emperors, their ecclesiastical as well as temporal supremacy was never openly opposed by the popes and clergy. Justinian, in his revision of Roman law, legislates for the Church as well as the State, and settles everything by imperial authority, from the creed on the Trinity to the number of blows of the scourge to be inflicted, or pious ejaculations to be uttered, for each offense under the penitential code. It is true that Pope Gregory II., writing to the emperor Leo, pleads that princes should not intermeddle with the affairs of the Church; but this was only in abatement of the alarming and unprecedented reach of power assumed by that most incorrigible iconoclast, and was also the date of the final revolt of the popes from the tyranny of the emperors. The emperors were always a check upon the popes, and restrained and baffled their ambition, and often humbled them, as well by their own as by the petty tyranny of the exarchs. It was only after the popes had shaken off their connection with and dependence on the emperors, and become a separate power, the assumed representatives and defenders of the Italian cause, standing unawed and isolated in their gigantic usurpations, that the Church rapidly reached the full dimensions of her predicted apostasy. This was about the middle of the eighth century. Gregory II. came in collision with and openly revolted from the dominion of the emperors, and their power practically died in the West with Leo, A. D. 741. "With Gregory," says Milman, with his eye on this very point, "we enter upon a new epoch of Latin Christianity."

Here, then, are three stages in the historic development of Antichrist, as an apostate Church, which we have denominated the hierarchal period, the State Church period, and the epoch of the revolt of the popes from the dominion of the eastern emperors, and their assumption of control of the powers of

human governments. This last epoch alone was marked by that well-defined trait of Antichrist, already mentioned, when he "should think to change times and laws"—an assumption of the absolute prerogative of God. This was the crowning act of Church apostasy; and nothing is better attested in history than that the popes did not assume it until the period of their revolt from the dominion of the emperors, and that they did assume it then.

The moral status of the Church was now clearly antichristian, and its relative attitude toward the civil powers of the world, brings it forth in distinct individuality. Its character and its acts are no longer complicated with state supremacy, but are strictly its own. The doctrine of one Catholic Church, the repository of all ecclesiastical power, and of all spiritual power for temporal absolution, and the channel of all sacramental grace for eternal salvation, had become a dogma. The primacy of St. Peter, and the lineal descent of the popes from him, had been an accredited tenet from the beginning of the fifth century. The doctrine of a Theocratic Church had drawn after it the inference that all seeming variations of opinion, being opposed to the unity of the Church, should be prohibited under anathema and suppressed by authority. The prohibition of the use and reading of such books as were supposed to contain heretical or injurious doctrine, had been enforced under anathema since the fifth century. Image worship, which had become only a compromise with heathenism and a substitute for idol worship, had become so thoroughly rooted and so universally popular, that not even the whole civil authority of the Roman government under two successive emperors, enforced by a sanguinary civil war, could displace or even check it in the West. The Teutonic and other barbarian conquerors of the West could easily transfer their adoration of the old divinities to the Virgin Mary and the saints. The penitential system had practically supplanted the evangelical doctrines of repentance and faith, and placed in the hands of the clergy the temporal punishment of sin. Monasticism, celibacy of the clergy, priestly absolution, auricular confession, the superstitious veneration of the sacraments, the denial of the Scriptures (particularly any translation but the Vulgate) to the common people, the right of the

Church to enforce uniformity of faith by civil and corporal penalties, the authority of tradition in fixing the sense of Scripture and the rights of the Church, these and other features of the "man of sin" had developed to antichristian proportions. Indeed, the student in Church history will not dispute the antichristian character of the Church at this time, but will object rather that we have not placed it earlier. To this, however, we repeat the answer, that the archetypal idea of prophecy, concerning the Church's apostasy, could not be historically developed and realized while the Church remained as a subordinate power of the Roman civil polity. Her assuming to "change times and laws" could never, from the nature of the case, coexist with her subordination to civil powers. The bond between the Roman Church and the imperial Roman State must be severed, the State Church period of her history terminated; and she thus individualized, standing isolated and apart, must be contemplated as acting out the genius of her own character unawed and unrestrained. The force of the argument under this head is to date the Church's apostasy, in her full antichristian proportions, at the middle of the eighth century, or A. D. 756.

2. We are to consider the Antichrist of prophecy was to be a Roman power. We mean not simply that it was to grow up within the limits of the old Roman empire, or that it was to have its seat in the ancient city of Rome, (both which are true,) much less that it was to be the civic empire restored; but that it was to be Roman in its character, the reproduction, in a form altogether new and peculiar, of the essential features of the old Roman dominion. Daniel saw this power as a "little horn" rising out of the head of the "beast," which symbolized the Roman empire, and John saw it as an "eighth" head of this same Roman beast. (Dan. vii, 7, 8; Rev. xvii, 11.) The government of the emperors would pass away, but Antichrist, like a phœnix, would rise from its ashes. Imperial Rome would perish, but, like the chrysalis, it was to inclose the elements of a new organization, which, after being warmed by the milder influences of Christianity, would become partially transformed and evolved into life. If it could be said of John the Baptist, coming in "the spirit and power of Elijah," that he "*was* Elijah," by the same law of language, and a slighter

metonymy, could the Antichrist of Daniel and the Apocalypse be called Roman. The civil empire of Rome was demolished in the West by the barbarous nations of northern Europe, in the East by the Saracens and Turks; but in the West the Roman *character* long survived, as in the East the Greek and Asiatic traits still remained. The civil subjugation, or even the Christianization, of a people does not annihilate the idiosyncrasies of national character, but will give them a new direction.

Three principal traits distinguish the Roman type of character: law, submission, dominion. The Roman mind was not speculative or inquisitive, like the Greek, but legislative and practical. Philosophy was not indigenous to Italy, but was always cultivated there as an exotic. But history and jurisprudence suited their genius; and of the latter it may be said, in the language of Frederic Schlegel, "it is the only original intellectual possession of great value to which the Romans can lay undisputed claim." In jurisprudence was represented the true bent and greatness of the Roman mind. The conquests of their victorious legions supplied new materials for the deliberations of the senate, and the application of that juridical polity which enwrapped in its iron folds the world, as known to the ancients, west of the Euphrates. The dominion of the world was the dream of the emperor, and the inborn conceit and passion of the subject. Age after age had left its distinct impression of nationality, and generation after generation had inherited the spirit of that "compact unity, that lofty pride, that grasping dominion, that sublime patriotism," which had at last erected the colossal proportions of a despotism such as the world had never seen. Daniel calls it "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly," (Dan. vii, 7,) and all allusions to it in the Apocalypse are of the same character. What form of Christianity could be expected to rise among such a people? After the civil empire had become extinct, and the spiritual life of the Church had declined into the mere chivalry of nominal proselytism, the genius of the people would erect an absolutism in the Church by the laws of moral affinity and the force of national tendencies, and it is thus the Roman hierarchy became a most natural result. It was simply the outgrowth of the mental habits and sentiments

of the people, when the higher life of Christianity ceased to become the law of action, and when the framework of civil government was demolished by the barbarians, leaving the Church as the ruling force and hope of society.

At an early period of Christianity the decline of spiritual life gave prominence to national and provincial tendencies in the Church. The Greek mind, ever given to speculation, its philosophy "insatiably inquisitive," early betrayed the Church into disputations upon profitless and impracticable abstractions. For centuries, almost all the controversies which agitated the Church arose from those portions of the world pervaded by the Greek mind and genius. Less anxious for the exterior form of the Church than for the metaphysical basis and the ætiological history of her doctrines, the Greek mind became prolific of questions which engendered factions, disturbed the general quiet, and quenched the living flame of piety. The tendency of the Western or Latin portion of the Church was exactly the reverse. The Roman mind, averse to philosophy, accustomed to submission, and satisfied with the plain, authoritative statements of truth, rested in the more quiet element of unquestioning faith; and, impelled by its own genius to the outwardness and juridical character of religion, devoted itself to the consolidation of the Christian body under one compact, digested code of discipline, administered by a hierarchy of which the Bishop of Rome was the culminating head. The tendency of the Roman mind, says Milman, was to "harden into inflexible statute that which before had been left to usage, opinion, and feeling. The East enacted creeds, the West discipline." It is easy to perceive, also, how, in such a condition of things, the habit of appealing controversies to the umpirage of the Bishop of Rome should have grown up almost insensibly among the Churches. In the fourth century (A. D. 347) the right of appeal to the Bishop of Rome was established by the orthodox Council of Laodicea, and sanctioned in A. D. 379 by the emperors Gratian and Valentinian, and in A. D. 421 the same was further confirmed by imperial authority by Valentinian III.

How could it be otherwise than that power should concentrate at Rome? The "eternal city" had been for centuries the political center of the world. Trade, travel, politics, art,

news, fashion, all had a central relation to Rome. The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople could not deprive Rome of all her ancient greatness. Besides, by removing at such a distance the presence of the emperor, it left the Bishop of Rome the most influential person in Europe, and for four centuries the events of the Church and the empire tended to confirm and exalt the primacy of the see of St. Peter with a constant, though generally insensible, advance of power in political affairs. The Latin language, the natural bond of the Roman family, continued long to preserve both the unity and pre-eminence of the Roman character. It was the language of the Vulgate Scriptures, of the liturgy, of the literature and learning of the Romans; and after the irruptions of the barbarous nations, when a babel of tongues threatened to deluge Europe, the Latin became more than ever not only a bond of Roman unity, but an instrument of priestly craft and ascendency. For a long time Romans only were intrusted with episcopal dignity. It was late in the sixth century (A. D. 566) before any but a Roman by birth appeared among the lists of the Frankish bishops. Popes Leo and Gregory the Great, both Romans by birth, and proudly inheriting the spirit of their ancestry, were scarcely less ambitious for the grandeur and perpetuity of Rome than for the defense and extension of the Christian faith. They were good representatives of the prevalent genius of the papacy. They both marked epochs in the Papacy and in the history of Christianity, and both developed the Roman type of mind in a new phase. "With Leo, Paul and Peter were the Romulus and Remus of Christian Rome;" and with Gregory, Church extension was but a new form of Roman conquest. Such was the spirit of the papacy and of the hierarchy. All missionary conquest abroad was consolidated under the absolute rule of the Roman See, not by the voluntary choice of the nominally converted nations, but by virtue of the divine right of the successors of St. Peter to universal dominion. Heresy, hence, became treason, and insubordination was punished as a crime. The penitential system was not less rigid than the Roman military discipline, and its penalties far more terrible to superstition than fines, scourges, imprisonments, or even death. The whole Papal theory of Church government and spiritual authority is but

the reproduction, in a new form, of the Roman idea of dominion. Popery could have arisen to complete success nowhere but in Rome; and the Church, having once lost its divine life, could take on no other form but Popery in Rome, and among native Romans. So far as these suggestions have any bearing upon the question of the date of Antichrist, it may be observed that though the argument naturally connects itself with the paragraph which follows, without which it is incomplete, yet it is obvious that, as a Roman power, Antichrist could not arise until Christianity had first conquered pagan Rome; nor until afterward when the Church, having lost its spiritual life and apostolic simplicity, had become in its turn interpenetrated by the reactive force of the Roman genius and character; nor until, finally, the convulsions of Europe had opened the arena for the ambitious aspirations of the papacy.

3. But Antichrist is not only a Roman power, but a Roman power of the later prophetic period—the last development of the old Roman dominion, which was to arise after the final extinction of the civil power of the emperors in Italy. The argument under this head is more conclusive as to date, because relating more exclusively to political events. Our space will admit of only a brief summary of the argument.

In Revelation xvii, 3, the "great whore," Antichrist, is represented as sitting upon a "scarlet-colored beast," which had "seven heads and ten horns." That this "beast" is a representation of the Roman power is so obvious and so generally admitted we shall assume it without discussion. The present argument relates to the "seven heads," their order and continuance, and the succession of the "eighth head," mentioned verse 11. These heads are thus explained by the angel interpreter, verses 9, 10: "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings; five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come, and when he cometh he must continue a short space." If we take the word "mountains" here literally, it is most natural to understand it of the "seven hills" on which the city of Rome stood. But it seems more in accordance with the style of the prophet to understand it symbolically to denote *forms* of *sovereignty*, as in Isa. ii, 2, and xi, 9; Jer. li, 25; Dan. ii, 35; Zech. iv, 7. Thus the "seven heads"

and the "seven mountains" are explained in verse 10 to be "seven kings," which, in prophetic idiom, are seven forms of government. This exactly corresponds to historic truth. Tacitus, their own historian, writing about the same time that John wrote the Apocalypse, in his enumeration of the different forms of Roman government says, "Rome was governed by kings, by consuls, by dictators, by decemvirs, and by military tribunes with consular authority." The triumvirates rather marked periods of disturbances, and were temporary and transitional. Tacitus mentions five, not including the imperial, which existed at the time of writing. John says "five are fallen, and one is, [the imperial,] and the other is not yet come." The coincidence is complete. There was but one other form of Roman civil government in Italy after the imperial, and that was the lieutenancy, or exarchate, which, says John, "is not yet come, and when he cometh he must continue a short space." It existed in Italy from A. D. 554 to A. D. 752. The Roman power was commonly symbolized by a beast with seven heads. (Rev. xii, 3; xiii, 10.)

Now, our argument lies here. It was after these seven forms of Roman government should have passed away that the "eighth" form should arise. It is to this eighth form that the attention is specially called by the angel nuncio. It is this eighth power that is to be the great persecuting power, the terror of the world, the reproduction of the entire beast, Antichrist: "And the beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." (Verse 11.) In verse 8 it is called "the beast that was, and is not, and yet is;" that is, "the beast that existed, then ceased to exist, and then reappeared." The Roman government existed under its "seventh head" (the exarchate) till A. D. 752. It then ceased to exist. It afterward reappeared under its "eighth" head, the papacy, in its full antichristian proportions. The dominion of this eighth head was indeed peculiar, a form *sui generis*, but so universal, so absolute, and so intensely Roman, (it was "of the seven,") both in the persons who swayed it and in its genius and character, that it might be well said the entire beast reappeared in this head. It was the last development of the Roman type of sovereignty. We claim, then, that this description of the prophet proves that Antichrist was

to be the last development of Roman power, and that it was to appear after the civil government of the emperors had become extinct in Italy, after the last form of the old civil dominion had passed away; that is, as history settles the date, after A. D. 752.

4. A further argument on the date of antichrist, corroborative of the foregoing, is found in Daniel vii, 8, 20, 24. After mentioning the "ten horns" of the beast, as representing ten kingdoms which were to arise out of the ruins of the Roman empire, the prophet speaks of another "little horn" that arose, "before whom there were *three* of the first horns plucked up by the roots;" "before whom *three* fell;" and again, "he [the little horn] shall subdue *three kings*." Here, then, it is specifically stated, in three different places, that three of the ten horns, or kingdoms, should fall before, or be plucked up by the little horn. That this "little horn" is a representative of the identical antichristian power of which John speaks under the symbols of the "harlot," the "beast," "Babylon," the "eighth head" of the beast, etc., and that the fall of the three kingdoms was a necessary preliminary to its full power and triumph, are too obvious to admit of dispute. The point, then, which concerns our present argument is, At what time did three of the ten kingdoms fall before the little horn, or papacy? In determining this point it is obvious we must first go back a step and identify the ten kingdoms. In this we shall follow Dr. Hales, who, after Machiavel and Bishop Lloyd, gives the following list: The Huns in Hungary; the Ostrogoths in Mœsia and Italy; the Visigoths in Pannonia [and Spain;] the Franks in Gaul; the Vandals in Africa; the Suevi and Alans in Spain; the Burgundians in Burgundy; the Heruli, in Italy; the Saxons in Briton; and the Lombards in Lombardy. As this list is from Machiavel, himself a papist, and has received the sanction of the celebrated chronologers, Bishop Lloyd and Dr. Hales, with other great names we need not mention, we shall assume it without discussion. We regard it as the only defensible hypothesis, substantially, which has been offered. Another point it is needful to premise, which is of still more importance to our argument. As the three horns which were plucked up seemed evidently, from all the descriptions, to have been directly and fatally in the way

of the "little horn," as obstacles to its ambition, so that their utter extinction became necessary to the success of its schemes, we seem directed to Italy as the seat of their empire and the scene of their catastrophe. Nowhere else could they fatally obstruct the ambitious schemes of the papacy. The question therefore simplifies itself into the following: At what time did three of the ten kingdoms, having their seat in Italy, fall? Wonderful are the coincidences of history! Just three, no more, no less, of these ten barbarian kingdoms had their seat in Italy, and fell. The Heruli, under their king and leader Odoacer, enter Italy, and by their conquest of Rome terminate the western Roman empire, A. D. 476. The Ostrogoths, under their king Theodoric, conquer the Heruli, subvert their kingdom, and establish the Gothic sovereignty, A. D. 493. Their kingdom continues till A. D. 554, when it is in turn subverted by Narses, and Rome once more becomes subject to the eastern emperors. In A. D. 726 Rome revolts from the Greek emperors, and in A. D. 752 the exarchate, and with it the Roman civil power, is forever extinguished in Italy by the Lombards, whose rising fortunes now overshadow Rome and eclipse the ambition of the papacy. The severest struggle that ever occurred between the popes and the barbaric kingdoms now ensued; but by the sword of the Franks, in obedience to the call of the popes, the Lombards were expelled from central Italy, and Rome forever delivered from their power, A. D. 756. Their kingdom is finally extinguished by Charlemage, the great champion and supporter of the Papal Church, A. D. 774. Thus the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards came in direct collision with the papacy, and were "plucked up by the roots" and destroyed.

The argument, therefore, under this head is conclusive, and stands thus: The rise of the "little horn" to the full proportions of Antichrist is to follow immediately upon the fall of three of the "ten kingdoms" which stood directly "before" it; the prophetic descriptions lead us to look to Italy as the theater of the rise and fall of these "three kingdoms;" the last of the three Italian horns or kingdoms fell A. D. 756: therefore this is the proper date of the establishment of the "little horn" in its full proportions as Antichrist.

5. Among the characteristics of Antichrist, as given by Dan-

iel and John, is the oft-repeated one of a *political sovereignty.* The hierarchy enslaved the souls and tyrannized over the consciences of men; but no less definite and indelible, as the mark and test of Antichrist, was the assumption of political sovereignty. Daniel repeatedly represents this power under the symbol of a "horn," (Dan. vii, 8, 20, 21, 24, 25,) which the angel interpreter decides to be the symbol of a "kingdom." "The *ten horns* out of this kingdom are *ten kings* that shall arise, and another shall arise after them, and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." Just as true as the "ten horns" denoted ten political sovereignties, so true did the eleventh, or "little horn" which "arose after them," denote a political sovereignty. So also in Revelation xvii, 9–11, just as true as the "seven heads" denoted seven forms of civil government, so truly did the "eighth" denote an eighth form of civil government. Mr. Faber argues, that because the "little horn" is represented as rising among and behind the "ten horns," and prior to the fall of the "three horns," therefore it must have existed as a horn while it was yet rising as an ecclesiastical power, and anterior to the date of the temporal sovereignty of the popes. And this would be conclusive if the positive reasons above assigned did not forbid. We cannot set aside the authoritative and inspired interpretation of Scripture itself, which decides that the "horn" in this place denotes "kingdom." We are therefore required to consider the prophet here as using the prolepsis, a figure of speech entirely admissible and common. He applies the title of "horn" to the papacy by way of anticipation, before it became possessed of temporal sovereignty, and while it was aspiring to that power. This could be done, according to a very natural and common law of language, without altering the symbolic meaning of the word which he himself had fixed. But to make the "ten horns" denote "ten kingdoms," and the eleventh, or "little horn," denote a priesthood, or ecclesiastical power, would be a violation of the laws of symbolic interpretation. So also, to make the "seven heads," (Rev. xvii, 9–11,) denote seven forms of civil government, and the "eighth" head to denote a Church power as such, is an equal violence done to right interpretation.

The question then to be here settled simply relates to the time

when the pope became a temporal prince. There is no fact of history better settled than this. Down to near the middle of the eighth century the popes laid no claim to civil supremacy. Gregory II., A. D. 729, in his letter to the Emperor Leo, says, "The doctrines of the Church are in the hands of the bishops, not of the emperor; *as the prelates should abstain from the affairs of State, so princes from those of the Church.*" The sovereignty of the emperors down to this date, says Milman, "comprehended religious as well as temporal autocracy, and of this the clergy, though they had often resisted it, and virtually, perhaps, held it to be abrogated, had never formally, publicly, or deliberately declined the jurisdiction." But now Leo inaugurates the war upon images, and brings the imperial and papal power in direct and fierce collision. Hitherto the papacy had been submissive and loyal to the civil power, but in Gregory it came to an open issue and revolted. The emperor commanded the destruction of images in all the churches, and Gregory, in retaliation, absolved the subjects from their allegiance to the throne, and their duty to support a heretical prince, and sounded the tocsin of war. This was late in his pontificate, A. D. 730, and led to the final extinction of the power of the emperors in Italy. It marks an epoch in the history of the papacy. Henceforward a career of political ambition and usurpation opened before the boasted successors of St. Peter. Gregory appeals to the Franks for aid, and his negotiations are important indices of the times. "They mark," says Milman, "the transition from the old to the new political system of Europe. They proclaim the severance of all political connection with the East. The pope, as an independent potentate, is forming an alliance with a transalpine sovereign for the liberation of Italy, and thus taking the lead in that total revolution in the great social system of Europe, the influence of which still survives in the relations between the transalpine nations and Italy. The step to papal aggrandizement, though unpremeditated, is immense. Latin Christendom is forming into a separate realm, of which the pope is the head. *Henceforth the pope, if not yet a temporal sovereign, is a temporal potentate.*" The events which followed during the next twenty-five years are spread out upon the page of history, and it is not important to our argument to trace

them. Suffice it to say, that when the step had once been taken, the Rubicon once passed, the assumption of the right of the pope to annul the obligations of civil government once openly made, and the East and West in actual war upon the issue of papal against imperial supremacy, it was neither in the temper of the pontificate nor in the possibilities of things to recede. By the aid of the Lombards the popes destroyed forever the civil power of the Roman emperors in Italy, and then, by the aid of the Franks, they exterminated the kingdom and power of the Lombards. Pending these events, Pope Zacharias had the address to hold at bay, for ten years, the arms of the Lombards, and without assuming the title, exercised the power and functions of a sovereign of Rome. Pepin, mayor of the palace, is crowned king of the Franks by Pope Zacharias, in opposition to the lawful claims of Chilperic, and the allegiance of the subjects transferred from the rightful to the usurping sovereign. By this act it was asserted and conceded that the power of the pope was above that of the throne. The allegiance of the subject, therefore, became dependent on the will and sanction of the spiritual authority of the successors of St. Peter. France now rapidly became the leading monarchy of Europe, and by her concurrent aid and powerful patronage the foundations of the temporal power of Antichrist were firmly settled. A few years later, under the pontificate of Stephen III., the arms of Pepin are again invoked. That prince is the second time anointed king of the Franks, re-enters Italy, subjugates the Lombards, takes from them the exarchate, and bestows it upon the pope as his patrimony and kingdom for ever.*

This event dates A. D. 756. It is the date of the final dismemberment of Italy from the rule of the eastern emperors; the date of the intimate and permanent union of the Roman see with the French throne; the date of transalpine interference with Italian politics; the date of the assumption and admission of the power of the popes, as the successors of St.

* The territory conquered and ceded for ever to the Roman See comprehended "Ravenna, Runini, Pesaro, Faro, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Jesi, Forlinpopoli, Forli, with the Castle of Lussibio, Montrefetro, Acerra, Monte di Lucano, Serra, San Marino, Robbio, Urbino, Gagli, Luciolo, Gubbio, Comachio, and Narni, which was severed from the dukedom of Spoleto."

Peter and the vicegerents of God, to dissolve the bonds of civil government whenever and wherever government clashes with the plans or doctrines of the Church; the date of the temporal sovereignty of the Bishop of Rome, and hence a new era both in the form and genius of the great apostasy; the date when Antichrist became not only a "harlot," a "Babylon," but the "little horn" and the "beast." Not that Antichrist had even now attained its largest growth of iniquity, or in its secular aspirations its greatest insolence of power; but that here and at this date it fairly puts on that historic outgrowth and form which answer to the descriptions of prophecy and the intimations given of the date of the 1260 years. From this period the rivalry between the miter and the crown openly raged, wherein the former, firmly seated in the superstitions of the masses, became thenceforward ascendant. Two hundred years afterward Gregory VIII. completed the structure which was laid in Gregory II. and in Stephen III.

We have not space for other branches of the argument leading to the same result, and must submit it upon the grounds herein already set forth. What, then, may be claimed as proven? 1. The Antichrist which struck the eye and engrossed the symbolism of prophecy was an arrogant, corrupt, persecuting, spiritual autocracy, the arch enemy and grand terror of the true saints, the leading obstacle to the advance and triumphs of the Gospel. 2. This Antichrist is clearly set forth as combining the distinct and heterogeneous characteristics of spiritual and political sovereignty. By the one it assumed to sway and decide the spiritual, and by the other the temporal and civil destinies of mankind. It is an apostate Church, organized into a spiritual theocracy, and a political usurpation corrupting the kings of the earth. 3. This mammoth power, the terror of the saints and the scourge of the earth, is to continue 1260 natural or solar years. It is then to fall to rise no more. But as, from the nature of the subject, as above shown, the event of its falling, as that of its rising, involves the revolutions of opinion and great moral changes of society, and must therefore be more or less gradual, it is not to be supposed that the power of Antichrist will continue in full force till the end of this period and then fall in one solar day or year, but that it shall wane, and the triumphant

cause of truth advance, till at the end of the 1260 years it will become an observable, recognizable fact of history—perhaps marked by positive dates in the constitutions and laws of nations, and in the extension, acts, and attitude of the visible Church—that "Babylon is fallen," for "strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." "Rejoice over her thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets, for God hath avenged you on her." 4. That the date of this period of 1260 years can be determined in no other way than by comparing the descriptions of prophecy as to the character and form of Antichrist, and the intimations of the time of its appearance, with the established facts of history; and just where, in the progress of history, the Church is clearly seen to take on this predicted form and character, just there we are to fix the date of the period in question. 5. As the date of the prevalence and reign of Antichrist must, according to the principles here laid down, be fixed at A. D. 756, therefore the end of the predicted period of his reign must be 756+1260=2016—the year of the Christian era set by Infinite Wisdom for this long-prayed-for event. Amen, and amen.

The events which are to follow the downfall of Antichrist, or the period of the 1260 years, are topics to be separately considered, not belonging to the plan of this article.

---

## Art. VI.—LIBERALISM IN EUROPE.

The difficulties in writing contemporary history are as great to-day as they ever have been. Nor have the improvements in communication, and in the diffusion of information by railroads, the telegraph, and the press, made it easier to judge accurately of particular events, and of leading public characters, or of the single elements of current history, than it was in the times of our revolutionary forefathers, or in the age of Columbus or Pericles. Opinions are now formed more rapidly, but probably not more correctly. True as this is of the great mass even of critical thinkers, it is to a greater degree so of the general public. The diversity of opinions about the characters of measures and of men in their own land is greatly

increased when we pass within the confines of another nation, with another tongue, and with prejudices based upon ancient antipathies of race and radically different social order.

That honest journalists, looking necessarily from their peculiar standpoints, should give a certain coloring to their writings and see significance in events not admitted by their opponents, is but what may be justly expected. But, as a rule, the journalism of the day is corrupted to a fearful degree by personal passion, party spirit, national prejudices, or pecuniary interest. And, again, no class of writers have done more to spread and confirm party divisions and the prevailing misapprehensions of each other by neighboring lands, than those travelers who pass rapidly through them, whose observations thus must be of the most hasty and superficial kind, but whose correspondence is written in a graceful or brilliant popular style, and is all the more valued because it claims to be impartial. Most readers have neither the capacity, time, nor inclination to examine these conflicting statements and sift out from them the truth concerning the events transpiring in other lands.

The history of our late rebellion furnished a most striking example of the difficulties a public in a foreign land labors under, in forming a correct opinion of great movements in other nations. Young countries always know more of the old lands, from which they have been colonized, than the old countries do of the new. But yet an extraordinary ignorance has been displayed by the writings and conversation of even the most learned men of the most learned nations of Europe concerning the antecedent American history, the merits of questions at issue in the contest, or the relative strength of the parties engaged. To this ignorance was added the confusion introduced by an active body of Southerners, who made gigantic efforts to mould European public opinion by their private intercourse in society and the publication of books and pamphlets. Disloyal Northerners wrote for the European press.* Correspondents were sent from Europe to America, to write down the

* During the last Presidential election we met, in London, a Mr. N——, of New York, who was employed by the Standard and Herald to write editorials upon American affairs, and also the "Letters from Richmond" and other parts of the South that graced the pages of those journals.

North and write up the South.* To give their correspondence a more insinuating character, it often contained "pictures of American social life." These were, at times, published in religious and family papers, and made Americans abroad burn with indignation, even more than the perverted presentations of our political life. The result was that the most cultivated classes of the most cultivated lands of Europe had very confused and erroneous views of American politics or society.

On the other hand, many of the most entertaining letters and books of European travel published in America excite the greatest indignation when reread or republished in Europe. And the letters of the "Paris Correspondents" upon the state of Europe often excite surprise and laughter, and would excite indignation had they any bearing on critical diplomatic relations.

It is thus, with a full knowledge of the difficulties of the task, that we attempt to present in our short article a view of the principles, divisions, present condition, and apparent tendencies of the liberal party in Europe. We expect in some, perhaps in many parts, to fall short of a true picture. But we shall, in all modesty, attempt to present the parties so true to the life, *from their own statements and those of their enemies*, that all honest-minded and well-informed partisans will recognize the portraits. Without adhering rigidly to any system, we will first approach the subject geographically, and then treat of some of the most marked characteristics of the general party divisions.

We will go first to the land where an Asiatic civilization has crowded upon European soil, and whose social and political institutions were crystalized during the latter parts of the middle ages, and have remained fixed during the changes that have swept over Western Europe. The Sultan of Turkey, his cabinet and foreign ministers, and a few other persons of rank, earnestly desire to see the modern sciences and arts introduced throughout the Ottoman empire. They are making especial efforts in Constantinople to establish popular scientific and artistic journals, and to introduce into the schools modern textbooks. They believe modern science and culture as compati-

* The "New York Correspondent" of one of the leading conservative papers in Berlin was a retired major who lived in Potsdam, sixteen miles from Berlin.

ble with the Mohammedan religion, as was the brilliant Arabic culture from the seventh to the seventeenth centuries. The great mass of the Mohammedan priests and people as yet resist this movement, as an insidious but effectual undermining of the religion of the Prophet.

The other nationalities in the Ottoman empire—which, by the way, are treated by the government with a liberality not found in any non-Mohammedan country—are in a condition with reference to progress very similar to that of the Turks. A few leading spirits are endeavoring to introduce reforms and new life. But the masses are wedded to the traditions and the ways of their fathers. The spirit of enterprise that pervades the faculty of the Armenian College at Smyrna is worthy of imitation in any land. Among the Greeks of Asiatic and European Turkey, a few merchants support by their money and influence the institutions of the nucleus of their future political hopes at Athens. But the great mass of Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, and Albanians are as stationary as they were four hundred years ago. In Asia Minor the true party of progress is the Catholic Church—this enemy of progress in Western Europe.

In Wallachia, which the believers in the near approach of the reign of Antichrist think will form the fifth toe of the right foot of the great image to be formed from the restored Roman empire, there is at present a most active political life. Prince Couza, by a *coup d' etât á la Napoleon*, has broken the power of the Wallachian feudal aristocracy, but apparently only to increase his own, and to establish a dynasty on the throne. He is trying to lead a national movement, and to persuade the eleven millions of Wallachians who inhabit Wallachia, Moldavia, Transylvania, Bessarabia, and a few adjoining lands, that he is to be their Victor Emmanuel, and Wallachia is to be their Piedmont. A similar position exists in Servia, except that the prince there has no constitutional assembly to oppose him.

In that other and vaster empire to the north, that unites Europe and Asia, covering nearly half of both, and whose government is also more Asiatic than European, political life can hardly be said to exist. The ancient and powerful aristocracy have for a long time brought pressure upon the emperor for a constitution similar to the "Magna Charta" that king John granted

to his barons. An anti-aristocratic liberal party can hardly be said to exist in Russia. However, the emperor, by the emancipation of the serfs, and inaugurating a system directly the opposite of the English, has flanked the aristocracy, and commenced to elevate the peasants and not the nobles.

This project of freeing the serfs, and thus weakening the power of the nobility, was one of the immediate causes of the late revolution in Poland. That movement was essentially aristocratic, and the aristocracy of Poland retains yet some of the offensive features of feudalism that have been long since laid aside in Western Europe. And yet, to gain strength in the late revolution, the leaders offered most liberal conditions to all who would join them. But the movement was never a popular one with the peasants. In Hungary the feeling of nationality pervades more deeply all classes of society. Feudalism is, however, as deeply rooted there as in Poland, and more deeply than in the rest of Europe, except England. The leaders of the opposition in Hungary desire the restoration of their separate constitution, and do not look for immediate independence from the Austrian crown.

Passing thence to the other stronghold of conservatism, in the southwest corner of Europe, we find that Spain is barely commencing to awake to the fact that we are in the nineteenth century. The introduction of railroads, and thus, by communication with the rest of Europe, of foreign manners and ideas, united with the excitable character of the Spaniards and the stinging rule of the present queen, are all preparing a powerful party, who will act with the very small but very active nucleus of Spanish liberals when another year of earthquakes shakes the nations of Europe. But at present "most Catholic Spain" is one of the most faithful adherents of the traditional conservative policy of the Romish Church.

Trimming off these lands, in which liberalism as an active agent in the world's politics cannot be said to exist, we come to several nations where liberalism completely controls the local politics, but where the small size of the countries, or other causes, prevent them from exerting a very powerful, or at least a direct influence on the destinies of Europe.

Greece, that land of ancient democratic traditions, after two thousand years of suffering from the oppressions of the Romans,

the still more oppressive corruptions of the Byzantine empire, and the later hard rule of the Turks, has been true to the spirit of liberty that drove the ancient "*τύραννοι*" from their thrones, and has but lately sent her incapable, perjured, and feebly despotic king back to his father's house beyond the Alps. The present boy-king is of very liberal feelings, but is in danger of being surrounded and controlled by the "copperheads," as their papers call the conservatives, and of thus suffering the same fate as his predecessors. Almost the entire Greek population are extreme republicans in principles. A king was only accepted, because, from a lack of a genuine political life, from a want of true self-sacrifice among the leaders, and from the influence of foreign intrigue, they felt compelled to accept temporarily a ruler of royal blood. The Greeks desire absolute liberty and equality before the law in all except matters of religion. They are almost unanimous in supporting a State Church, and in giving other religious persuasions but little liberty, and none at all in proselyting. The Greeks have, without exception, been most enthusiastic friends of the Union during the whole history of the late rebellion.

The resistance of little Switzerland to foreign oppression has become a proverb in history. Within her own borders, however, her jarring cantons, by their long feuds and continual strifes, have presented a picture of Europe in miniature. And until these feuds were allayed, by the adoption of her present federal constitution, (modeled after that of the United States,*) the government of these cantons was as aristocratic as that of the Venitian republic. And even now the ancient families look with an evil eye on those who took the power from their hands. Nor has the reformation of the statute-books been complete. The Jews suffer yet under many legal disabilities, and full religious liberty is not yet obtained. A large part of the Swiss press and people were against the North till the very close of the rebellion!

Passing down the Rhine to where it enters sluggishly into the North Sea, we come to neat, sluggish, mercantile Holland, which is never mentioned in European politics. Its government is good and liberal. The radical party never gets

* Adopted by the personal suggestion and under the personal influence of our late distinguished embassador, Hon. Theodore S. Fay.

out of sight of the last end of the political movements of the day.

The stirring little semi-Gaulic neighbor to the west is about evenly divided between the conservative, or ultramontane Catholic party, and the liberal, almost radical, republican party. This last is in the van on all the political questions of the day. By constant activity they keep a majority in the Parliament. As the late king rather sympathizes with them, they have only to keep a sharp eye on the intrigues of the opposing party, and on the wily leopard in Paris. They have been the firmest and most outspoken friends of the Union during the whole of the war.

All Scandinavia is so liberal that there is there but little more than the form of monarchical government. Most especially is this true of Norway. The late war has given the small aristocratic party in Denmark a temporary lease of power, but they can do nothing against the deep-seated political feelings of the country. All hereditary titles of nobility have lately been abolished in Denmark. In Sweden there is more class distinction in the population than in the other sister lands. In all three there is a lack of due religious tolerance. Last year full religious liberty was granted to the Methodist Episcopal Church in Denmark—a privilege not yielded to any foreign Church since 1748.

We come now to Italy, France, Germany, and England, the four great lands of modern European culture, learning, and refinement, and the battle-grounds of liberalism against conservatism, of aristocracy against democracy, and of despotism and class-distinction against liberty and equality.

Italy has needed to look but little beyond her own history to guide her in the late great movement for independence, national unity, and civil liberty. The wrongs and oppressions of ages of misrule by foreign nations had stung her to exasperation. The monuments of the glory of Etruria, of ancient Rome, and of the medieval republics, stood daily before the eyes of her humiliated citizens. The contests of these turbulent republics, whereby the foreign enemy was enabled to enter and drain for centuries the riches of her cities and fertile plains, stood as a warning that was never forgotten during all of the late struggle. And Italy stands to-day a powerful,

united, armed, free state; with more of true political and religious liberty and equality than exist in any other important state in Europe. Happily the aristocracy mostly sided with the deposed governments and were swept away with them. And at present the government party in Italy would be called radical in England. It is united against privileged classes in society, but is composed largely of those who consider a limited constitutional monarchy to be the ideal of human governments. To these are added a large number of republicans, who support the present government as the best to be had under the circumstances, and who see in divisions only the return of the foreign oppressor. A small "*codino*" ("copperhead") party oppose the government on all questions, and favor a return of the old regime. Another and far more powerful opposition is made up of uncompromising republicans. Probably, if the present royal family were all dead, and the question were submitted to the people without outside pressure, a large majority would go for the establishing of a republic in Italy to-morrow, and would sustain it too. The dangers at present menacing "free Italy" are the enormous expenses incurred to keep the army on its present "peace" (!) footing, and above all the Napoleonic system of official corruption, that is creeping into the administration, is rapidly alienating the republicans, who are mostly self-sacrificing, incorruptible men—like their leaders, Garibaldi and Mazzini.

In France, the restless pioneer in all political movements of Europe, the spirit of liberty that has been active since the end of the last century, has never had more zealous champions than at the present time. By the first revolution, feudal aristocracy was swept away beyond the hope of recovery. The succeeding upheavals of the last fifty years have not given time for new divisions of classes in society to be formed. Persons of all grades have equal rights in the letter of the law. The forty-five per cent. of the whole population who cannot read or write are almost wholly under the controlling influence of the Ultramontane or conservative party of the Catholic Church, as are perhaps another five per cent. of the educated classes. Another portion of the faithful Catholics accept the dogmas as infallible, but disregard as much as they choose the personal authority of the priesthood. Without

the support of a strong and ancient feudal aristocracy, and representing no great popular principles, the emperor, having risen to power by perjury, maintains his place only by official corruption. His warmest supporters (friends he has none) will desert him as soon as they see the star of his power declining. The history of modern civilized nations gives no parallel to the corruption that he has introduced into the government of France to-day. And the whole array of civil and military officials will do everything to check inquiry into their official conduct, or eject them from their positions, until they see a new movement is sweeping the emperor from power, and then they will swing their hats the highest of all for the new movement, be it Orleanist, legitimist, or republican. But, besides the Catholic and governmental parties, there remains a strong party, of unknown force, who are in principles the most advanced liberals of Europe; at least they number in their ranks two thirds of the learned, thinking minds of France—of those master-spirits who move public opinion. Burning with rage at the brilliant despotism that holds their beloved France in chains, they are awaiting quietly the next turn in events, which will enable them to do wisely and permanently what they have tried thrice to accomplish—to give France a liberal government. The hope of the liberals lies in their intellectual strength, their moral purity, and their aggregation in the Capital and those ganglionic centers of the national life, the provincial cities. With these in their hands, the rural districts will fall into the line by their very *vis inertiæ*.

Passing from France to the land of her jealous neighbors across the Rhine and in the center of Europe, where action is as sluggish as thought is rapid and talking is profuse, we find liberalism and conservatism distributed in very uneven proportions in the thirty-four different states of Germany. The defeat of Solferino was the new birth of the liberal party in Austria. In no part of Europe has absolutism been more encroached upon during the last five years than in that prince of despotic states. The same is, to an extent, true of Austria's pet poodle, Bavaria. With less of direct despotism, that paradise of beer-drinkers has many more medieval feudal restrictions upon trade and enterprise than its more powerful eastern neighbor. In Wirtemberg, and especially in

Baden, the government is more generous, and the liberal party is stronger and more active. But in all south Germany the liberals are in the minority. The peasants are less educated and more under the power of the clergy, Catholic and Protestant, (both of which are arrayed on the conservative side on all political questions throughout Germany,) than they are in the states north of the Main. Of the smaller states of north, or rather central Germany, Saxe-Coburg is almost the only one in which the government gives the liberal party any active influence in the politics of the day. Most of the others are virtually as absolute as Russia. In several, as Nassau, the Hesses, and the Mecklenburgs, many of the offensive features of feudalism remain. In Mecklenburg the nobles have the right to flog their peasants, and they use it too. The natural result is a great emigration from these small states to America, or to those neighboring lands that are more generously governed. Hanover and Brunswick are as retrograde as most of the smaller states. Saxony, during the late war with Denmark, has played the liberal, but only to head off Prussia in its schemes to absorb Schleswig-Holstein. The free cities were known in medieval times as aristocratic republics, in distinction from the petty monarchical despotisms of the three hundred and more other German States. This character they retain to a great extent to this day. They are neither in form nor spirit pure democracies. The ancient families form social circles as aristocratic and exclusive as the nobility at Berlin or London.

Prussia is to-day the representative land of Germany. Here industry, learning, culture, religion, rationalism, benevolence, profligacy, liberalism, aristocracy, despotism, and military organization, reach their highest German development. On test-questions, the Church, (Protestant and Catholic,) the nobility, and the government officials are on the conservative side. The liberals claim four-fifths of the learning—the master-minds—and a majority of the voters. They claim also, as in France, to control the capital and the great provincial towns. Should another contagion of revolution sweep over Europe, it would break out first in Paris and next in Berlin. But the organization of the Prussian army is such that, almost without exception, the officers, being nobles, would be on the side

of the government. And the government trusts in its really extraordinary discipline, and in exciting an antagonism between the army and its citizens, to suppress any outbreak. The liberals assent to the aggrandizement of Prussia, "with the hope of some day sending off their king and raising the standard of German unity." Other liberals hope to see the future king of Prussia the emperor of Germany, with a liberal and effective constitution and parliament.

Leaving for the present Great Britain, where the conditions of political life are essentially different from those on the continent, we will proceed to look at the divisions, principles, and prospects of the liberals in Germany, France, and Italy. There is so much *solidarité* between them that a single classification will hold good, indeed, for all continental countries. With a thousand minor divisions, they fall into three grand classes: the constitutional monarchists, the republicans, and the socialists.

The first class, composed of the more cautious or timid portion, who fear sudden irruptions and violent changes, and are bound by ties of tradition and antiquity, consider the highest ideal of human government to be a constitutional monarchy, in which the reigning monarch is a zero, only occupying the place of sovereign but divested of his power. The English monarchy is their ideal. But, unlike England, this party will have no aristocratic privileged classes, but would give equal political rights to all, and open the gates of official appointment and promotion to all persons of talent. They would have a parliament elected at short intervals and the government conducted by a ministry nominated by the sovereign, but to be confirmed by the Parliament and answerable to them for its acts, and subject to removal by them. In this way they think would be gained all the advantages of a hereditary monarchy and an elective republic. There will be a settled, irremovable line of sovereigns, with no turbulent changes of rulers; there will be all the social dignity of an ancient dynasty and a brilliant court; and the voice of the people will really control the government. The constitutional monarchists include, in Italy, the governmental party, and nearly one half of the whole population; in France, the legitimists and Orleanists, (who have both learned wisdom by adversity,) and a

small portion of the government party; and in Germany a small part of the government party, with a numerical majority of the liberal opposition.

The second division of constitutional liberals includes those who consider the republican form of government, essentially as embodied in the Constitution of the United States, to be the most just and the best form. With them are numbered, almost without exception, those liberals who have been in America, and that very small number who, at home, have carefully studied and understood the contents and practical workings of our Constitution. A much larger number argue philosophically that such must be the true form of government. In Italy, that land of so brilliant republican traditions, this party includes two thirds of the opposition, and some who support the government against their theoretical views. They number on the whole not far from one half of the whole population. In France, this party retains great vital power, in spite of the failures that have as yet attended its struggles. It would be impossible to estimate with any accuracy its numbers, but it is supposed by many well-informed to include more than half of the French liberals, and a large share of the thinkers of the country. Its real influence would be greater in a crisis than its present avowed numbers would indicate. In Germany, nearly the same is the case. Many of the leading thinkers and writers in history, philosophy, and criticism, and some prominent deputies, are thorough-going republicans. But among the masses their adherents are few in number. The peasant is loyal to his king.

The number of socialists is small; but they include some of the most acute, active, and brilliant minds of the age. They are looked upon by most classes as harmless theorizers, and they have really but few followers among the masses. They consider themselves as much in advance of the mere republicans, as the republicans consider themselves in advance of the constitutional monarchists, or as these do of the absolutists. They consider an absolute monarchy, with a feudal order of society, as embodying all the evils possible to human government; and their socialism to avoid all the evils and to embody all the good possible for the human race to realize in government. And they foresee the time, in the dim future, when the

system will be universally adopted. Their representative leaders were the late Prudhon in France, and Lasalle in Germany. To understand well their position, we must transfer ourselves to the continent of Europe, where the offices as well as the powers of the government are much more extended than with us. There the state not only controls the diplomatic relations with foreign nations, the maintenance of public order and security at home, the army and navy, the support of the poor and unfortunate, the collection of the public revenue and the direction of the post, as in America; but all these interests are controlled in a more direct way than with us, and with a feeling of more central authority; the theory being that the rights of government originate with the rulers, not with the ruled. But also, in Europe, the state retains to itself many other powers. It holds and cultivates as a source of revenue large national (or royal) domains, especially of forests and mines. It reserves to itself certain monopolies, as the production of salt and tobacco. The whole educational system, from the most elementary school to the universities and the academies of science, are under its control. It supplies the funds for their support, names their officers, and nominates, removes, and promotes the instructors, at pleasure. It enters into the religious education of the people; requires all to be baptized and confirmed before they can be married, enter any business, or take any office. It supports at least a State Church, and nominates its pastors. It appoints and promotes all lawyers, judges, and physicians. It controls industry, and reserves to itself the right to interfere whenever and to whatever extent it may choose. It restricts the press when it wills. The socialists hold that the state—not the monarch, but the embodied will of the people—should have all these rights, and should also absorb within itself all the remaining rights of property; that the individual can no more possess or inherit property than a monarch can claim or inherit a throne, (*la propriété c'est le vol;*) for all are born into the world with equal natural rights with respect to property as well as to government. The individual is thus to be swallowed up in the state, and is to receive from the state such a position as his talents most fit him for. They argue, also, on the mere ground of success, that if the post is better conducted by the

state than by the individual, so would merchandise and manufacturing be. They say that the principles of the American republic could not be carried out in the days of the Magna Charta; and that their principles, though just, cannot be carried out to-day; but that the world progresses rapidly now, and they will soon be appreciated and applied. One thing at least that they say is true—that they are not appreciated now. For beyond the circle of the brilliant writers who hold and advocate these views, there are very few, in the ranks of active business men, or in the lower classes, who will listen to any such a reorganization of society. They are attempting by unions and journals to familiarize the minds of the laborers with their views. Their present practical proposition is to get the laborers who wish to enter business, or to expand business already established, to ask loans from the state *as their right*, since the government gives loans and subsidies to railroads and other "enterprises of *rich* men." This is their present way to solve the critical "social problem" in Europe of the "contest between labor and capital."

(It may be well to allude here in passing to another attempt to solve this social problem, to release labor from the tyranny of capital in Europe, (this expression sounds strange to us here where the laborers command the position and get what wages and conditions they like, and the capitalist cannot help himself,) under the leadership of the distinguished Herr Schulze-Delitzsch. This active man has organized throughout Germany hundreds of these "trades unions," the purpose of which has been, not merely to assist each other in trouble, but also to gather funds, to be loaned to such of their own number as have good credit and need to make loans for expanding their business. The effect of this has been so beneficial upon the German laborers that a year or two ago the members of the unions, by small contributions, raised a magnificent testimonial to present to their benefactor.)

All the classes of continental liberals have made it a leading principle to break away from all *political* authority which is merely traditional. They carry the same principles into another field, or, as they say, into another branch of the same field. They recognize in Luther a great reformer, who attacked and crippled the authority of the Romish Church—

a traditional authority. But they consider Luther as only the John the Baptist of the great reformation which is to come, which shall dethrone not only the Catholic, but also the Protestant Church, and all forms of Christianity. They see in the history of Christianity only a long and dark array of traditions based upon superstition and prejudice, of bloody religious wars, of social and political feuds, of imposition by an ignorant or hypocritical priesthood upon the consciences and property of the deluded and defrauded masses, and of a clergy used by despotic governments for spies and for a spiritual police. With every shade of difference of philosophic view—from theists and advocates of a "beautiful religion of reason and nature alone," to Materialists, who consider the "spirit only a chemical product of the brain, which will perish with it"—the liberals, almost without exception, agree in opposing evangelical Christianity. From this enmity to Christianity are excepted, of course, the strong catholic element of the present government party in Italy, and a very small fraction of the liberals of France and Germany. It is but just to say also that the public moral character of the leaders of the liberals is, as a rule, as free from reproach as that of most professing Christians,* while for generous open-hearted benevolence they often surpass far the European Christian. This is indeed their religion. Americans who were abroad during the war will bear testimony how, as a rule, they were so much more warmly and sympathetically treated, during the hours of darkness of our national misfortune, by the unchristian liberals than by Christians, either Protestant or Catholic. The few marked exceptions to this on the part of the Christians were all the more marked because so rare.

In the eyes of these antichristian liberals, America inherited from bigoted, puritan England a great curse to her progress in civilization, in the deep religious sentiment that has hitherto marked her history. But "in a free country free views will ultimately prevail," and they look forward with hope to the future. From the vast tide of emigration from Europe to America, they see it to be only a question of time when at the polls they will control the elections, mould the

* The unfortunate end of Lasalle by a duel two years ago was one of the few exceptions to this.

legislation, and, by the importation of their literature and the immigration of their men of science and art, they will remould the whole social feeling and national character. Some of them think that Prussia will share the fate of Florence under the Medici, and that her most brilliant period of culture will soon pass; that it is useless to resist the bayonets, and that "in the interest of liberty" it is better to go to America and there build up a great free nation, that by the very might and majesty of its presence will overawe the despotisms of Europe. To avoid present troubles, and not seeing indeed any cause for anxiety in the future, the governments of the German states are very glad to have the troublesome spirits get out of the way. The influence of this great and increasing immigration upon the future of our country is a subject worthy the deep attention of all American patriots.

The views and feelings of a portion of even these German liberals toward America is very different, since victory has rested on the banners of the Union, from what it was during the weary years of our suspense and disaster. America had the sympathy, undivided, deep, and sincere, of the liberals of France and Italy during the whole of our contest. But in Germany that pride, if not arrogance, of opinion which unfortunately so often characterizes really great and learned men, led many of the cultivated liberals to think that they understood America much better than did the Americans themselves. These saw in the war a legitimate result of the possession of individual property when not restrained by armed force as in Europe, ("the North was making the war to rob the planters of their rich estates!") or an example of the inability of Christianity to restrain the passions of its followers; or another of the sad examples of history where two peoples, blinded by hate and by antipathies of race and climate, rush madly to each other's destruction. Some said that both parties equally sinned against the principles of free government, the South by keeping slaves, and the North by forcing a people against its will. Again, others said—with reference to the proposition propounded by a few most noble northern patriots, to take away the state government from the states and reduce them to territories, or "to conquered provinces," and which proposition was presented as the sour

policy of the government—"If in a free government a rebellious province loses all its constitutional rights, what can we liberals oppose to the course of Austria and Russia in taking away the constitutions of Hungary and Poland?" Thus many liberals were very lukewarm in their sympathy for America. But the noble virtues developed by the war; the incredible philanthropy shown by the people for the army; the mighty military prowess of the young republic, culminating in its victory over the gigantic rebellion; the magnanimity shown to a fallen foe, unparalleled in European history; the rapid return of civil law; and the quiet return of the vast army to the pursuits of peace, have not only drawn the wavering liberals back to their admiration of America, but have sent a feeling of uneasiness and dark foreboding for their own future through all the aristocratic classes and despotic governments of Europe.

Differing as they do in the foundations and principles of their faiths, the Catholics and Protestants of the continent occupy essentially the same ground on all political issues. Their whole influence is conservative, and they join hands against their common enemy, the infidel liberals. The majority of the German Protestants see in liberals, in any country, only a pack of chained hyenas, who, as soon as set loose, will rush upon society, repeat the scenes of 1792 and 1848, and keep up a perpetual anarchy, for very love of it. They thus keep the liberals from ever attending their churches, (they would as soon make a social call upon a leper as upon a German republican;) they delight the liberals for the food they furnish them for their hostility to Christianity; and they drive Christians with liberal politics over to the enemy. They consider the late civil war in America a fearful but logical example of the necessary result of democratic institutions. Some of the evangelical writers in Germany, most read and most loved in America, were outspoken in their opposition to the Union. The republicanism of the old Puritans is a mystery to them.* Of true religion in America they think there is but little.

* Last winter an English Independent preacher, who had lived many years in Germany, sent an article to a leading religious paper, advocating republicanism from the Christian standpoint. Such firebrands of the devil were not admitted to the columns of a Christian paper.

That this should be, to a great extent, the position held by the Catholics, is but in accordance with their usual history. But throughout all Italy the majority of the Catholic population are liberals. The lower priesthood are about equally divided. The higher orders are mostly conservative. But among the higher orders there is an important number, headed by such as Father Passaglia and Cardinal d'Andrea, (with still others secretly sympathizing with them, but who dare not show themselves,) who are clamorous for the pope to lay aside his temporal power, and who are conscientious liberals. In France the same feeling is making great headway among the clergy. Count Montalembert and Archbishop Dupanloup are the most powerful and active advocates of it. (The North has had no more steadfast and able defenders in Europe than these two most worthy men.) The party who are advocating full religious liberty and separation of the Church from the State, are gaining powerful adherents even under the very shadow of the Vatican. They say: "The Church suffers from its connection with the State. She is made its servant, spy, and police. She is placed by the state under restrictions, especially with reference to the education of the clergy, and then is blamed because her clergy are inefficient and uncultivated. The holy Catholic Church rose, through three centuries of persecution from the state, to be the religion of the ruling nation of the world. She has risen in spite of the state, and now she does not ask the favor of the state." And among the surprising changes that appear in the kaleidoscope of history, may be the spectacle of this party rising to power in the Catholic Church, and this be the first of all the Christian Churches in Europe which shall demand separation from the state. This party further say that "in the interest of our holy religion we must insist on full religious liberty. Where there is liberty the Church of God must prevail." The rapid progress the Catholic Church has made within the last thirty years in England and America, and the magnificent plans the Church has laid for the future in both these countries, gives them reason to believe that by adopting a similar course they will flank the liberals in Europe also.*

* A remarkable passage occurs in a work which lately appeared in Berlin, entitled "*die Deutschen in Amerika.*" Speaking of the religious future of America, the author

In England the relations of the political parties and of the divisions of society upon religious questions are altogether different from those on the continent. That boasted cradle and home of constitutional liberty is, in all the elements of political progress, far behind Italy or Belgium. It may indeed be doubted whether it is ahead of France or Prussia. Certain it is that if the military rule, the restriction of the press, or the trampling upon the rights of the Parliament, that are practiced in Prussia, were attempted in England, there would be a revolution to-morrow On the other hand, if in Prussia only members of the national Church could be professors or students in the universities or gymnasiums; if the electoral privileges were so limited and so unjustly distributed; were the taxes so unevenly divided as in England, the cool, patient Germans would have also a revolution to-morrow. In no other enlightened country is the feeling of class-distinction, the respect to high birth, so profound and so widely extended through all grades of society as in England. Among the non-noble, middle classes, who are spurned and kicked from the social circles of the aristocracy as much as the poor white trash are from the parlors of the planter, there is not one in a thousand who would not consider it the happiest circumstance of his life to receive a title of nobility, or to have a sister or a daughter married to a lord. It is thus that the nobility is constantly replenishing and enlarging its ranks. A poor, penniless second son of a noble marries the daughter of a rich merchant. He gains wealth, and she social position. The moral and intellectual character of the nobility is thus kept to a very high standard, for an aristocracy, by constantly drawing on the best materials of society. The Church of England draws from the dissenting Churches in the same way. It is more "respectable" (and that means something in England) to belong to the Established Church; and as the constant accessions from the pious ranks of the dissenters have kept it pure in doctrine and practice, consci-

says it will lie in the hands of the Catholics or the Methodists. These two bodies are the largest in numbers, are growing the most rapidly, are the most zealous, and have the most organic power, and they will eventually be the contestants for religious supremacy in the United States. The views of the author certainly are deserving of careful attention by those who are considering at present a union of all the Methodistic bodies in the United States.

entious scruples against joining it disappear. Especially is this the case where the father was a non-conformist from principle, but the children have grown up subject to the social influences around them. In England, too, it is "respectable" to belong to and to attend Church, especially the Established Church. Thus with more open and brutal vice than can perhaps be found in any country on the continent, there is in England more vital piety than in any continental land, and a high moral and religious sentiment exists and must be bowed to in all public movements.

The influence of England in its restless, meddling foreign policy has been as often, perhaps more so, in favor of wrong and oppression as for humanity and liberty. In speaking of the internal politics, one has to use quite different terms, or the same terms with quite different meaning from those we give them when speaking of the continent. The radicals, represented by John Bright and Richard Cobden, hold essentially or practically the ground of the constitutional monarchists on the continent. The present whig government is called *liberal.* But in the elections for Parliament last year it was impossible to tell wherein they were more liberal in principle than the tories. The tories charged the government with weakness, time-serving, and double-dealing in its foreign policy, and seemed very anxious to get into power. But on all practical questions of reforms, and progress in civil liberty, and of the diminution of the enormous privileges, there was as much unanimity as there was lately with us, between the Republicans and Democrats, in "supporting President Johnson." Not having suffered the temporary (but merely temporary) horrors of a revolution since the days of Cromwell, this England, which three quarters of a century ago was in the advance guard, a pioneer among the nations of Europe in civil liberty, has already been overtaken by most, surpassed by many, continental states. In the contest of aristocracy and rank in society against practical democracy, she has fallen behind most states; and there is every prospect that she will be left far in the background by her bolder neighbors.

## Art. VII.—THE TWO METHODISMS, NORTH AND SOUTH.

The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is to meet during the spring at New Orleans, and many changes it is expected will there be made in the ecclesiastical organization. On which we may note,

1. Most of the changes are grounded upon the assumption that the Methodist Episcopal Church is hostile, refuses all union or recognition, and menaces destruction to the Church South. That Church makes no offer of fraternity; its press, especially the "great official" at New York, puts forth only hostile utterances; and apparently nine in ten of the northern membership ignore all claims of the Church South to the Christian name; and the whole northern Church is straining its energies to prosecute a system of "aggression" aiming at the disintegration of the Church South.

2. To prevent this consummation, it is proposed to change the name of their Church, dropping the affix "South," and announcing their Church as a candidate for practical universality. The name most prominently popular is "The Episcopal Methodist Church." Dropping their sectional name seems to our sanguine Southern friends removing the great obstacle to their over-spreading our hemisphere. We shall soon have the new-named Church overshadowing us as the big bird Roc did Sinbad the Sailor, covering us with sudden night.

3. In order to prevent all fusion, they propose to make changes for the purpose of *differentiation*. If the two Churches remain similar, they will, so it is argued, assimilate, and like kindred drops be mingled into one. To prevent our swallowing and assimilating them, they will transform themselves into something utterly indigestible. They will remove all restriction upon the appointing power as to the length of pastorates. They will adopt Lay-delegation. They will inaugurate a more staid, settled ministry, competent to keep as well as to make converts.

4. Their special antagonistic doctrinal platform is to be the utter banishment of politics from the Church; and, if we mistake not, all political topics from the pulpit. Hereby they are at issue with the Church North, which by its political action (on the slavery question) has demoralized itself. They can then deny that they are a proslavery Church just as they are not an antislavery Church; for slavery being a political topic the Church takes no sides. Individually, indeed, every man the Church might be a slaveholder

both in principle and practice, but the Church is neither *pro* nor *anti*. We note per contra,

1. While it may be that the tone of our Northern press has been unsympathizing and square toward the Southern Church, that fact may have arisen from its being supposed that the Southern Church was still truly disloyal, and utterly flouted any proposition of reunion or recognition. The more exact truth has been slowly appearing; but the impatient South seems to be now making up her mind for permanent hostility. Thus a perpetual feud is the result of misunderstanding. Did but the South stand firm and self-possessed, truth and a better feeling might come with time.

2. The arguments for the organic changes appear contradictory. If the Northern Church is so menacing, what danger is there of assimilation? Hostility is a sure enough separator, and if it be not effective, then the assimilation is a peaceful and happy one. If the Church South fully fuses into the Methodist Episcopal Church, it becomes the Methodist Episcopal Church, and possesses all its prestige of wealth, power, greatness, and universality. If a lake fuses into the ocean it becomes the ocean; and when the ocean says I, the drops that formed the lake are included and may say I, as being so much ocean. Our Southern friends make us think of the old aboriginal New York Dutch race, with whom, as with the South, "damnedyankee" was "agglutinated" into a single word. They hated the incursions of the Yankees as they hated pestilence. But the Yankees would come in multitudinous swarms, bringing industry, opulence, morality, schools and churches; and the acres and square inches of soil beneath the Dutchmen's feet grew *golden*, and the Dutchmen became, in spite of themselves, princely Knickerbockers and millionaires!

3. Changes made for the very purpose of Churchly division, and to prevent Christian assimilation, are immoral and irreligious. They are in the worst degree schismatic. The blessing of the great head of the Church cannot rest upon them. And they are to the Church South at the present time, in our view, most deeply dangerous and destructive. We have entertained no great respect for the pet notion of "disintegration;" but for the first time we detect its omen in these profound radical changes. Great numbers of Southern Methodists, attached to their old institutions, will come to find them in our Church. Others, if they must have staid pulpit performance, will seek it in other Churches. Others, if there is to be diocesan episcopacy, will prefer the regular old article. Meantime their rural sections will fall into the hands of our elastic

itinerancy; and as for the permanent stations of large towns, our ministry, thanks to our colleges and institutes, have a far better training for settled conservative purposes. By every change made it will be found that they incur a disadvantage.

4. But that non-political platform, forsooth, is to work wonders in opening to them an incursion into the North! Let them come. We have already, in a former Quarterly, maintained the right of each Church to cover the whole nation, if it can. *It is no* "aggression." Let then "The Episcopal Methodist Church" come and convert our Copperheads, or anybody else, into the best sort of Christians they can. But, coming with any prestige of copperheadism and rebeldom, Southern Methodism, under whatever name, is not likely for the present generation to find a very alluring prospect in the North. Throughout our North the non-political platform will be held as cowardly, false, and treason-smelling; *cowardly* because it is evidently framed to avoid the maintenance of ethical right which is often involved in political questions; *false*, because the pulpits, periodicals, and books of that same non-political Church are often the most political extant; *treason-smelling* because it was in disunion and rebellion that that platform will be thought to have come into existence.

The Church South needs none of these differentiating efforts; whether the change of organism or the adoption of a special platform. Could she but stand firm, unchanging, calm, and hopeful in her tracks, a few short years would, as the nation blends into one, bring mutual understanding and ultimate union. And how benign our influence might be to restore that national oneness! It must take time, and forgetfulness of many a past irritation; it would require an effort of faith, and love, and prayer. That the two Churches should divide was necessary while slavery lasted. That they should not affiliate and ultimately become harmonious, can be the result of only some great wickedness.

Literal slavery is indeed *a past question.* The humane dealing with the negro, (upon which the favorable action of Southern Conferences has been very explicit,) is a question of degrees and shadings. There is at the present hour no wider practical difference between our two great American Methodisms than between the English and American Methodisms. And if the latter admits the heartiest interchange of churchly courtesy, why should the former wholly exclude it?

Our own Church does not know (as the fact has been somewhat overlooked by our Northern press) that repeated propositions have

been made from high sources in the Southern Methodist papers, for some steps looking toward conciliation. We have not preserved them and cannot precisely restate them. One made by the ex-editor of the Southern Quarterly Review, Dr. Summers, was, as we recollect, something more decisive than the following: Let the northern board of bishops select three bishops, three elders, and three laymen, and offer to consult with an equal commission of the Church South. Let them hold an interview, and discuss with prayerful solemnity and sincerity this question: What can be done to harmonize the two great Methodist Churches in feeling and action? Let them then publish to the two Churches, either conjointly or separately, by report or address, the conclusions at which they have arrived. While these proceedings are in process, we would ourselves add, Let the prayers of both Churches be offered to Almighty God, in which, with full repentance for all that is wrong in his sight, individual and organic, we may implore the divine guidance to all that is holy and right, especially to such measures as will purify and unite us in love to a common Saviour, and make our harmony a rich blessing to our common country. And as we are, in the providence of God, destined to be citizens of one great nation, so let both Churches unitedly pray that all separating and disuniting causes may be removed; that the spirit of repentance for all past sin, of love and concord with each other, and of justice and *equity to all men*, may fill our hearts, that we may rejoice together in the greatness and glory of our one united nation, and cherish loyalty to its government as founded upon the principles of truth, righteousness, and freedom. Such a measure could make no near approach to reunion; it could exert no organic, only a moral, power. But would it not be a most Christian procedure, and produce a most salutary moral influence? Would it not be a spectacle on which the nation and its Churches, and the great Head of the Church himself, would look with approving interest? Might it not prevent years of heart-burning and mutual hostilities? Might it not save thousands of souls lost by our ecclesiastical wars and discords? Might it not do much toward restoring our country, purified by fire and blood from its greatest organic sin, to a unity of heart? Might it not *hasten the renunciation of the spirit and doctrine of slavery* from the hearts of Southern Methodists, and incline them to harmonize with the best Christianity of the age? And we believe that precisely as prayer shall prevail throughout our Church in the spirit of the Saviour's prayer that all might be *one*, so will such measures come into existence and move toward a blessed success.

# Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

## PROTESTANTISM.

### GREAT BRITAIN.

Colenso — *His Return to Natal — A New Aspect of the Controversy.*—We have traced in former numbers of the Methodist Quarterly Review the history of the Colenso controversy-from its beginning until the return of the bishop to his diocese. The arrival of Colenso in Natal, which occurred November 6, 1865, produced, as was to be expected, an immense excitement. The clergy of the diocese, with one solitary exception, were determined to disown Colenso as their bishop, and to accept a new bishop whom the Metropolitan of Capetown, with the consent of the other bishops of the Church of Africa, has declared himself determined to appoint for Natal. The attitude of both the Metropolitan and the clergy of Natal were approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as appears from the following letter of the Archbishop to the Dean of Natal:

Addington Park, Croydon,
October 8th, 1865.

My Dear Dean: On my return from a short tour on the continent, I found your letter of the 1st August, accompanied by the resolutions agreed upon at the meeting of the clergy and representatives and lay communicants of the diocese of Natal, in the cathedral, on St. Peter's day. The Bishop of Capetown has sent me his answers to the questions put to him by the assembled clergy and laity at Maritzburg, and I consider them to be judicious. I do not see how you can accept Dr. Colenso as your bishop without identifying yourselves with his errors. The bishops of the Church of England, I believe, with scarcely an exception, have either publicly prohibited Dr. Colenso from preaching in their dioceses, or have intimated their unwillingness to permit him to do so. At any rate, he has not, so far as I am aware, preached in any diocese, except on one occasion, so that the great majority of the bishops have withdrawn from all communication with him. As to the appointment of a Bishop of Natal, the Church in South Africa has been pronounced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be just as independent as any of the Nonconformist communities; and under this view is, I conclude, competent to elect its own bishop, without reference to the authorities in England, either civil or ecclesiastical. Nor, as I conceive, will such an act separate you from communion with the Church of England. The Scotch Episcopal Church is in communion with us, but elects its own bishops, and is not obliged to submit to appeals to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. May the Lord bless and guide yourself and the Church of Natal under your present trials. Believe me, dear Mr. Dean, yours very faithfully, C. T. Cantuar.

As regards the dispositions of the laity, the accounts from Natal greatly differ. The bishop, in a letter to a friend in England, claims to have met with quite a sympathetic reception. When he landed at D'Urban, he says a large deputation waited on him to present a very friendly address, signed by one hundred and forty-eight persons, after which they begged him to stay over Sunday and preach. The clergyman and his two churchwardens protested; but the church was crammed, both morning and evening, and "all went pleasantly." The Church people protested against the church-wardens' protest, on the ground that they had made it without having called a vestry meeting, and in distinct opposition to the wish of the congregation. At St. Addington the bishop received another warm address, signed by the two churchwardens and thirty others, and preached to the people. At Peter Maritzburg he was met within a mile of the town by a troop of fifty cavalry. In the town a large body of people greeted the bishop with cheers, and a kindly address bearing one hundred and seventy-one signatures. At Bishopstown the natives welcomed the bishop in the most demonstrative way. The Natal correspondences of the English Church papers, on the other hand, represented the attitude of the laity as quite different, and left no doubt that the great majority of the active church-members would disown, together with the clergy, the jurisdiction of the bishop.

On November 30 Bishop Colenso addressed a long letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, entering fully into the circumstances of the decrees of Natal and the proceedings of the clergy. The bishop declares that a sense of duty to the Church, of which he is a minister, to the sovereign whose appointment he

holds, and to the cause of truth and justice, requires him to protest respectfully against the course which the archbishop has thought it right, as the primate of the Church of England, to pursue in his case. After complaining that he had never yet been heard in his own defense, Bishop Colenso says, in conclusion:

"I feel, my lord archbishop, that I have now a right to ask your grace before my fellow-countrymen to point out as publicly and distinctly what those "errors" are of mine to which your grace refers, if any such have been already condemned by the existing laws of the Church of England. Or should your grace not be able, as I venture to believe you will not, to produce any passages of my works, for which the humblest priest could have been ejected from his cure by any one of the bishops in England, upon the principles by which the Church of England is governed, as laid down in any judgments hitherto given, then I feel that I have a right to demand, in the name of common justice, that your grace should present a petition to the Queen, specifying those parts of my writings which you deem to be "errors" of such a kind as to justify my deposition, and praying that her Majesty would be pleased to appoint a commission to examine into the justice of this charge. I am a bishop of "the United Church of England and Ireland," and not one of "the Church of South Africa," with which, in common with the great body of the laity of Natal, I neither have nor wish to have at the present time any very intimate relations. And I claim for them and their children, as well as for myself, the right to enjoy the liberties and be judged by the laws of that Church to which it is our privilege and our pride to belong. We do not wish to put ourselves upon the footing of the "Scotch Episcopal Church," as your grace suggests, so as to be merely "in communion" with the Church of England; we desire to belong to it, as the Wesleyans in Natal are a branch of the great Wesleyan Society. We count it no evil, as your grace implies, but a great advantage, to be ruled by the decisions of her supreme court of appeal, and to be saved thereby from arbitrary and prejudicial proceedings of irresponsible ecclesiastical judges."

To this letter the archbishop, on February 10, 1866, made the following reply:

LAMBETH PALACE, February 10.

MY LORD: I have duly received your letter of the 30th of November, containing a complaint of a wrong which you imagine I have done you by a letter that I wrote to the Dean of Maritzburgh. In answer to this charge I have no hesitation in avowing that, according to my belief, you have been duly and canonically deposed from your spiritual office, according to the common law of the Church of Christ, as set forth in the concluding paragraph of the 26th Article of the Church of England, and I must decline to hold myself responsible to you for entertaining such a belief. I have never obtruded this opinion upon others in my capacity as Primate of the United Church of England and Ireland, but I have not hesitated to avow my private opinion when it has been sought for. Nor, when my counsel was asked by those who were in doubt and difficulty, did I shrink from imparting it. I never expected that my letter would have been given to the public, nor am I responsible for the fact; but as those to whom I addressed it have thought fit to publish a portion of it, I do not disavow the sentiment therein expressed. At any rate, I could not have objected to the course they thus took from any apprehension that I might one day be called to sit as a judge in your case, because I have high legal authority for saying that there appears to be no mode of proceeding by which I could be legally called upon to act in that capacity. The censure therefore which you would impute to me on this ground proves to be entirely without foundation. As you ask me to point out the errors to which I have alluded, I have merely to refer you to the reasons for your deposition, as stated in the judgment of deprivation passed upon you, and to state my belief that for such errors in doctrine an English clergyman would have been ejected from his cure. I am not aware that I have ever indorsed with my approval every act of Bishop Gray's connected with your deposition, up to the time at which you wrote, as you seem to assert. No one can more deeply deplore than I do the present unhappy condition of the diocese of Natal; but let God be the judge with whom rests the responsibility of this lamentable division in a regularly constituted branch of the Church of Christ. May it please Him to guide into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived, and to restore peace where there is now, to our great sorrow, discord and dissension. I am, my lord, your faithful and obedient servant,

C. T. CANTUAR.

The Bishop of Capetown, in a letter to Colenso, offers to the latter to have the sentence of deposition (recently disallowed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which Bishop Gray entirely ignores) revised by the Archbishop of Canterbury or by the Bishops of the United Church, but by no lay authority.

In the event of Bishop Colenso refusing to accept the above offer, the Bishop of Capetown has declared his intention to pronounce sentence of excommunication upon Colenso, as approved by a diocesan synod, and to nominate and consecrate a new Bishop for Natal.

Bishop Colenso is aware that the public opinion in the Anglican Churches throughout the world is almost unanimous in demanding his exclusion from the Church. The only protection which he discovers for his anomalous position is the spiritual supremacy of the Queen in the Church of England. He therefore takes extreme ground in favor of State Churchism. In reply to an address presented to him by some of the prominent lay members of the diocese, he makes four points:

1. That the Church of the colonies has voluntarily made choice of the Church of England as her authority. 2. That the Queen's supremacy, as opposed to that of the bishops and archbishops, is the law, the great foundation principle of the Church of England; that the Queen, as representing the whole nation, is the supreme arbiter of all causes which may arise within its pale, spiritual as well as temporal; and that the bisops only exercise jurisdiction in the Church, as it is delegated to them from the Crown, and hold their courts in the Queen's name. 3. That the result of the second proposition is to give greater personal freedom than can ever be obtained by those who depend on ecclesiastical tribunals. Lastly, that he (Dr. Colenso) has a right, in the present state of the law, to say and teach what he conscientiously believes to be true.

The subscription to the Colenso Fund, intended partly to help the bishop in his Chancery suit to recover his salary from the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund, and partly to testify to "the great services rendered by the bishop for the cause of free expression of opinion within the Church," amounted at the close of last year to about £3,700. On the list is the Right Rev. Samuel Hinds, D.D., late Bishop of Norwich, together with thirty-eight clergymen of the Church of England; two peers, (Lord Belper and the Earl of Lovelace;) thirteen members of Parliament; and a great number of men eminent in science or letters.

THE ROMANIZING MOVEMENT—*Important Letters from Dr. Pusey—He delares in favor of the Supremacy of the Pope, and of the Decrees of the Council of Trent.*—The Romanizing movement in the Church of England has recently once more manifested itself with a power astonishing to both friends and foes. It is found that the comparative quiet which has for several years been observed by the leaders of the movement did not mean retreat, but preparations for taking new and bolder steps. The movement, in its new stage, is again led by Dr. Pusey, from whom, when first started, it derived its name. Dr. Pusey has recently come forward as an avowed champion of a union between the Churches of Rome and of England, laying down his views in a work entitled "Eirenikon," and a number of newspaper articles. The most outspoken of these letters is the following, addressed to the editor of a Roman Catholic paper in London, which we give entire, as a document of lasting importance:

To the [R. C.] "Weekly Register," Christ Church, Oxford, Nov. 22d, 1865.—Sir: I thank you with all my heart for your kind-hearted and appreciative review of my *Eirenikon*. I am thankful that you have brought out the main drift and objects of it, what, in my mind, underlies the whole, to show that, in my conviction, there is no insurmountable obstacle to the union of (you will forgive the terms, though you must reject them) the Roman, Greek, and Anglican communions. I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained *authoritatively*, namely, by the Romish Church itself, not by individual theologians only. This involves the conviction on my side that there is nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightfully as not contradicting anything held to be *bona fide* in the Roman Church. The great body of the faith is held alike by both; on those subjects referred to in our Art. XXII, I believe (to use the language of a very eminent Italian nobleman) your [our] *maximum* and our [your] *minimum* might be found to harmonize. In regard to details of explanation, it was not my office, as being a priest only, invested with no authority, to draw them out. But I wish to indicate their possibility. You are relatively under the same circumstances. But I believe that the hope which you have held out, that "the authorities in the Roman communion might hold that a reunion on the principles of Bossuet would be better than a perpetual schism," will unlock many a pent-up longing—pent up on the ground of the apparent hopelessness that Rome would accord to the English Church any terms which it

would accept. May I add that nothing was further from my wish than to write anything which should be painful to those in your communion? A defense, indeed, of necessity involves some blame, since in a quarrel the blame must be wholly on one side or on the other, or divided; and a defense implies that it is not wholly on the side defended. But having smoothed down, as I believe, honestly, every difficulty I could to my own people, I thought that it would not be right toward them not to state where I conceive the real difficulty to lie. Nor could your authorities meet our difficulties unless they knew them. You will think it superfluous that I desired that none of this system, which is now matter of "pious opinion," should, like the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, be made *de fide*. But, in the view of a hoped-for reunion, everything which you do affects us. Let me say, too, that I did not write as a reformer, but on the defensive. It is not for us to prescribe to Italians or Spaniards what they shall hold, or how they shall express their pious opinions. All which we wish is to have it made certain by authority that we should not, in any case of reunion, be obliged to hold them ourselves. Least of all did I think of imputing to any of the writers whom I quoted that they "took from our Lord any of the love which they gave to his mother." I was intent only on describing the system, which I believe is the great obstacle to reunion. I had not the least thought of criticising holy men who held it. As it is of moment I should not be misunderstood by my own people, let me add that I have not intended to express any opinion about a visible head of the Church. We readily recognize the primacy of the Bishop of Rome; the bearings of that primacy upon the other local Churches we believe to be matter of ecclesiastical, not of divine law; but neither is there any supremacy in itself to which we should object. Our only fear is that it should, through the appointment of one bishop, involve the reception of that quasi-authoritative system which is, I believe, alike the cause and (forgive me) the justification in our eyes of our remaining apart.

But although I intended to be on the defensive, I thank you most warmly for that tenderness which enabled you to see my aim and objects throughout a long and necessarily miscellaneous work. And I believe that the way in which you have treated this our *bona fide* "endeavor to find a basis for reunion on the principle debated between Archbishop Wake and the Gallican divines two centuries ago" will, by rekindling hope, give a strong impulse toward that reunion. Despair is still. If hope is revived in the English mind that Christendom may again be united, rekindled hope will ascend in the more fervent prayer to Him who "maketh men to be of one mind in a house," and our prayers will not return unheard for want of love. Your obedient servant, E. B. PUSEY.

This letter, of course, produced a sensation. The High Church party, as a whole, are by no means prepared to go so far as Dr. Pusey. Many prominent men of this party deemed it their duty to express strongly their dissent from it. Rev. A. Gurney, the Anglican minister in Paris, and a very active partisan of High Church ritualism, (though on the subject of future punishment he thinks pretty much as Mr. Maurice,) not only strongly protested against the opinions of Dr Pusey, but declared a readiness to unite even with the dissenters for the purpose of arresting this Romanizing movement. In the opinion of Mr. Gurney, he is no longer the leader of the Anglo-Catholic party, but stands virtually almost alone in thought, and represents scarcely anybody but himself." Says Mr. Gurney:

> The movement has gone long past him, and has left him stranded, obstinately looking backward. He belongs to a generation of the past, the Church leaders of thirty years ago, who had to feel their way slowly and painfully into "Catholic truths," and most of them learned to associate them, almost inevitably, with a great foreign working system, and to gravitate swiftly or leisurely toward Rome. Most, not all; not the Hooks, Palmers, Gresleys; not Isaac Williams, perhaps a greater name.

In reply to this and similar remonstrances Dr. Pusey wrote several more letters, explaining what he considered as misapprehensions of his views, but reaffirming the main point, namely, that he admits the superiority of the Pope, and believes the decrees of the Council of Trent capable of an interpretation which would harmonize them with the teachings of the Church of England. Dr. Pusey has since been on a visit to several Roman Catholic bishops of France, and was reported to have stayed one night in a Dominican monastery. The High Church papers of both England and the United States are mostly very reserved in their comments on Dr. Pusey's new position. But few dare openly to express concurrence with his views; but many refrain from any dissent, and even shield him from the attacks of the

Low Church party, thus suggesting the opinion that there is, in general, more sympathy with him than it is deemed safe to admit at this present time.

It is a remarkable fact that the Convocation of Canterbury, which met on February 2d, and was in session several days, adjourned to May without taking any notice of Dr. Pusey's remarkable letter. Another manifestation of the Romanizing party, however, called forth a protracted discussion: the Romanizing innovations in the ritual. These innovations have been carried by some clergymen to an extent which has abolished almost all differences which distinguished Anglican from the Roman Catholic worship. Imitations of the Mass Book, the Breviary, and all the liturgical works of the Roman Catholic Church, have been published for the use of the clergy of the Church of England. The Book of Common Prayer has been translated into Latin, with the scriptural passages taken from the Vulgate, and other adaptations to the Church of Rome. To arrest this tendency, two different methods have been tried by the opponents of the movement. The "Association for Promoting a Revision of the Prayer Book, and for securing purity and simplicity in the public worship of the Church of England," was of opinion that the most successful agency for this purpose would be found in a Royal Commission, constituted like that which, two years ago, had to consider the terms of clerical subscription. To this new commission, in their opinion, should be referred not only the lectionary and the rubrics, but also the canons, and constitutions, and occasional services. A deputation of the association, headed by its president, Lord Ebury, had an interview with both Earl Russell and the Archbishop of Canterbury; neither of whom, however, held out to them any hope of support. Earl Russell stated that the Government would not act in this matter without previously consulting the Archbishop of Canterbury. The latter expressed a conviction that in acceding to the wishes of the Association, he would affront the convictions and disappoint the expectations of an overwhelming majority of both the clergy and the lay members of the Church.

A larger number of clergymen and laymen was represented by a deputation, headed by Dr. Wordsworth, which presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury a memorial "in reference to the recent introduction into the celebration of divine service of practices which, by their diversity and by their deviation from law and long established usage, are disturbing the peace and impairing the efficiency of the Church." "Without venturing to suggest any remedy for the evils," of which they complained, the memorialists asked the archbishop to "devise, in concert with his suffragans, the best calculated measures to repress illegal practices, and secure uniformity in the celebration of the divine service in the national Church." The archbishop, in reply to this deputation, declared himself to be "deeply impressed with the gravity of the circumstances in which the Church was placed by the ritualistic innovations recently introduced in some few quarters." He expressed an "anxious desire to promote uniformity in public service," and the belief that the first step taken by the bishops would be "to ascertain distinctly what the law allows and what it does not allow."

In opposition to both these memorials, another was presented to the archbishop on February 3d, signed by 2,970 clergy and 36,008 lay communicants, "respectfully objecting to any alteration being made in the Book of Common Prayer respecting the 'ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof," and the mode and manner of performing divine service according to the use of the Church of England." The archbishop in reply, repeated, in substance, the views he had expressed on former occasions; especially his determination "never to consent to any alteration in the Book of Common Prayer without the full concurrence of Convocation."

At the session of the Convocation of Canterbury, in February, both Houses had an earnest discussion of the Ritualistic question. The Lower House adopted a resolution recognizing "the evils which may arise from an excess of ritualism," but, nevertheless, deprecating "any attempt to avert those possible evils by the introduction of changes in the prayer book," and requesting the bishops to adopt proper measures. The bishops, in reply, directed the Lower House to inquire, by a committee, as to such measures as to them might seem fit for the desired object.

## THE GREEK CHURCH.

REVIEW OF THE YEAR 1865.—*Intercommunion with the Anglican Churches.*

—No important change occurred during the year 1865 in the mutual relation of the different branches of the Greek Church (in Russia, Turkey, Greece, Austria) to each other. In Austria, the Greek Church, which, in accordance with an imperial rescript of Nov. 26, 1864, is henceforth to be officially designated as the "Greek-Oriental," instead, as heretofore, the "Greek Non-United Church," is now fully separated into two independent archbishoprics, one for the Greek Sclavi and the other for the Roumanic nation. For the latter, Andrew Baron de Schaguna was appointed, in 1865, the first archbishop.

The Moldo-Wallachian Church has been declared, by Prince Couza, to be henceforth wholly independent of and disconnected from the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical communion remains perfect as before; just as between the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. This declaration of ecclesiastical independence by the Church of the Principalities did not please the Sultan, and at his instance the Patriarch of Constantinople tried the old plan to retain his former subordinates. He dispatched a bishop to Bucharest to declare that the law of civil marriage, the secularization of convent property, and the institution of a national Church, lately decreed by Prince Couza, were contrary to the dogmas of the Greek Church, and involved the penalty of excommunication. Prince Couza, in reply, ordered the said bishop to be reconducted to the frontier by gendarmes. The reorganization of the Church has since been completed by the establishment of a National Synod; and on the whole, the Church of the Principalities seems to be the most progressive of the branches of the Greek Church.

The movement toward a union between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches has many influential friends in Russia. The most important step which has yet been taken on the part of Russians in favor of this movement, was the participation of several men of high position in a meeting held in London on Dec. 16, 1865, at which about eighty of the bishops and clergy of the Church of England were present. Russia on this occasion was represented by Prince Orloff, Minister of Public Instruction in the Emperor's Cabinet, and Count A. Tolstoi, the representative of the Russian government in the Holy Governing Synod, and author of a work on the Latin Church, together with the Russian chaplain in London, the Rev. Mr. Popoff. Prince Orloff, in a letter to the *Moscow Gazette*, one of the leading political papers of Russia, gives the following account of the attitude of the Russian members of the meeting:

Having premised that I was speaking in a private capacity, I said that the Russian clergy, praying daily for the establishment of a common Christian Church, would be always inclined to promote it. In proof of this I alleged that the study of the English language had been introduced into our ecclesiastical academies, and that our clergy would be prepared to sift privately all disputed points. I added, however, that the most holy Philaret, the Archbishop of Moscow, and lofty patriarch of our Church, was of opinion that this was a grave and difficult question, which ought to be slowly matured, and above all, investigated closely and minutely. In conclusion I moved: 1. That works should be published in England setting forth the history, doctrine, and present condition of the Anglican Church, with a view to proving that it is not a Protestant but a Catholic Church, and, accordingly, related to the Eastern Church. I also remarked that the subject being altogether unknown to the Russian public, it ought to be explained fully and copiously. 2. That Anglican clergymen sympathizing with the cause should be stationed at Moscow and St. Petersburg. 3. That the matter should not be precipitated, or urged with too much eagerness or violence, but that we should trust in the divine assistance rather than in the success of our human and short-sighted endeavors. What we had to do now was to prepare the ground by elucidating the question. The seed would grow up, and future generations, perhaps, would reap the harvest if God willed it. Father Popoff, who delivered an eloquent speech, breathing the spirit of Christianity, expressed himself to the same effect. After him some clergymen spoke on dogmatical points. I omit quoting their opinions; they will be probably communicated by Father Popoff in his report to the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod. They had no immediate reference to the matter in hand.

Before the close of the debates I rose again to declare that the Russian Church, being but one of the five branches of the Eastern Catholic Church, the matter was all the more complicated, and that the subordinate members of our clergy were not at liberty to decide any ecclesiastical questions, being entirely guided by the rules and directions of their Church.

The day after I paid a visit to the Archbishop of Canterbury at his country seat. He would have liked to dispatch two bishops to Russia, but, hearing what I had to say against his plan, put it off. The Bishop of Exeter, the nonagenarian patriarch of the Anglican Church, also speaks with great interest of the work of reunion. The matter has nothing whatever to do with politics, though if a reunion were effected the Russian and English interests in the East might possibly become identical.

The *Church Journal*, of New York, a devoted advocate of the Union movement, regards the part taken at this meeting by Russia as "a step more important and significant than anything that has been placed on record since the time of the Council of Florence."

The indications increase that this movement may become one of importance. Our literary intercourse with Eastern Europe is, however, still so restricted that we are but imperfectly informed about the progress it has made in the Russian and the other Eastern Churches. The London *Pall Mall Gazette* has the following remarks on the recent history of the movement:

The project of union, or rather intercommunion, between the Russo-Greek and Anglican Churches is no new thing. The true author of the scheme was Peter the Great, at whose suggestion the English and Russian bishops entered into correspondence on the subject. The negotiations were protracted, through the inability of the Russian bishops to give satisfactory explanations in reference to the national practice of image worship, and on the death of Peter were discontinued, a result, or want of result, which has often been deplored by orthodox Russians, and among them by Mouravieff, the historian of the Russian Church. The revival of the project of intercommunion is due, in a great measure, to the journal which distinguished itself during the Polish insurrection by its enthusiastic support of the historian's brother, the "hanging Mouravieff," of Wilna notoriety. Five years ago the present editor of the *Moscow Gazette* published in the *Contemporary Leaves* (one of several journals directed by him) a remarkable correspondence between the Rev. Mr. Williams, Fellow of a college at Cambridge, and Admiral Putiatin, who had then recently arrived from Japan to take the command of the Ministry of Public Instruction. The admiral sent to the *Moscow Gazette* a letter he had received from Mr. Williams, pointing out the facility with which Russians might send their sons to study at the University of Cambridge, and recommending the erection of a Russian church there, and the appointment of a Russian chaplain. Since then the *Moscow Gazette* has on many occasions urged the desirability of bringing about a good understanding between the Russian and English Churches; and it was this journal that first published the account of the meeting held recently in London, at which Prince Orloff, Father Popoff, and a number of English prelates, were present. Admiral Putiatin was well known in the Russian navy for his habits of devotion; but it is no calumny on Peter the Great to say that, in endeavoring to establish intimate relations between the two Churches, he was actuated less by religious than political motives. He wished to counterbalance, as much as possible, the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in Europe, and especially in Poland. The Russians attach much more importance to the London meeting than really belongs to it; and a writer in a St. Petersburg journal has come to the conclusion that the English tourists who visit St. Isaac's Cathedral do so from a pious wish to make themselves acquainted with the ceremonies of the Russian Church.

The English Church papers which are in favor of the union movement assert that the advances toward a union, made by the Anglicans, have met with a particularly favorable reception on the part of the Greek Bishops of Servia. The London *Churchman* expressed its joy at being able to

Record another instance of the disposition of the Servian Church to resume that Christian intercourse which is paving the way for complete recognition and intercommunion. Three clergymen from London, passing through Belgrade recently, were detained in that city on the Sunday. When the Archbishop knew this, he placed at their disposal the antechapel in his own palace for the purposes of holy communion, and supplied them with the necessary elements, altar lights and other requisites. "The Metropolitan expressed at the same time his great regret at not being able to be present in person at the celebration, in consequence of being obliged to go to Racovitza, it being, it would seem, a high festival; but he intrusted the carrying out of the matter to one of the Archimandrites, who remained with us throughout the office."

The *Levant Herald*, an English paper in Constantinople, having stated that the Archbishop of Servia had degraded the Archimandrite of Studenitza for administering the Holy Communion to an English clergyman, the *Churchman*, of

October 5, contradicted this report by the following statement:

We are requested by the Rev. W. Denton, to state that the report of the censure and degradation of the Archimandrite of Studenitza for administering the holy communion to a member of the English Church is wholly unfounded. The Archbishop of Belgrade has replied to Mr. Denton's inquiries as to the truth of the assertions in the *Levant Herald*, and he states that the thought of degrading or of censuring the Archimandrite had never entered into his mind. We are in possession of information which leads us to believe that before long the Servian Church will take a more formal step toward intercommunion with the Anglican Church. At present we forbear to say more.

As regards the Church of the kingdom of Greece, a correspondent of the London *Churchman* stated that the Holy Synod was "ready to acknowledge as valid the baptism of the Anglican Church when intercommunion shall be realized." The "Hemera," (the Day,) a journal which has a wide circulation in Greece, the Ionian Islands, Turkey, and Egypt, published, in 1865, a series of letters from Dr. Frazer on the Constitution of the English Church, and on her Synods and Liturgy, which seemed to awaken considerable interest in the question among the Greek people.

## Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

Germany continues from month to month to make contributions to the literature on the Life of Christ. Among the latest works of this class is the ninth volume of Bunsen's Bible-work. (*Bunsen's Bibelwerk.* Leipsic. 1866.) This volume concludes the Bible-work, and consists of a Life of Christ, compiled from the Gospels, and is so arranged as to be read through on the Sundays and other days consecrated to public worship. To this is added, according to the usual manner of Bunsen's works, a great number of dissertations, partly critical, partly philosophical. The standpoint of Bunsen with regard to the nature of Christ agrees, in the main, with that of Schenkel and his school, being strongly tinctured with rationalism.

Professor Ewald, well known as one of the greatest Orientalists now living, has published a second edition of his work on Hebrew poetry. (*Allgemeines über die Hebräische Dichtung.* Gottingen. 1866.) It has undergone such alterations as to be almost a new work.

A new edition of the New Testament Apocrypha has been begun by Professor Hilgenfeld. (*Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum.* Fax. 1. Leipsic. 1866.) The first part, which has been published, contains the Epistle of Barnabas, the original text of which is now for the first time published in a complete state from the Sinaitic manuscript. Prof. Hilgenfeld's edition contains, besides the original, the ancient Latin version. The origin of the Epistle is placed by Hilgenfeld at the end of the first century.

The *Neue Evangelische Kirchen Zeitung*, of Berlin, one of the leading religious weeklies of Germany, notices the appearance of Hurst's History of Rationalism, which it calls an instructive and carefully compiled work. It mentions the circumstance that the author for some time pursued his theological studies in Germany, and deems his work worthy of a German translation.

Of Professor Tischendorf's great work, *Monumenta Sacra inedita. Nova Collectio*, a new volume, has recently been published. (Leipsic. 1866.) It contains a hitherto unknown palimpsest, containing all the Epistles of the New Testament, (the Revelation, embraced in the same palimpsest, will be published in the next number of the *Monumenta.*) Tischendorf found this palimpsest in 1862, in the library of the Russian Bishop Porphyrius, and he obtained permission from this learned bishop to make the manuscript more legible by the application of chemical means, to decipher and publish it. According to the specimen which the author gives in the preface, the manuscript gives the sacred text in a most antique manner, and is in this respect surpassed only by five of the ancient manuscripts. The prospectus of the

continuation of the *Monumenta* announces the appearance of five more volumes. The work has a large number of patrons among the princes and high ecclesiastical dignitaries of Europe. Among the latter the names of Roman Cardinals appear side by side with Anglican bishops.

Another new work by Prof. Tischendorf is entitled *Apocalypses Apocryphæ*. (Leipsic. 1866.) It contains five apocryphal "Revelations," which have not heretofore been published. One of them is the "Revelation of the Apostle Paul," which has been supposed to be lost. It corresponds entirely with the references to it in the works of Augustin and Sozomen. Tischendorf found the Greek text in the libraries of Milan and Munich. A Syriac enlarged translation of it has recently been found by English missionaries at Ooroomiah.

A new work on the Apostle Paul (*Der Apostle Paulus*. Heidelberg. 1865) has been published by A. Hausrath, a member of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of the Grand Duchy of Baden, and a prominent representative of the theological school of which Dr. Schenkel is regarded as the chief. His work differs from that of Dr. F. C. Baur, as it does not treat prominently of the doctrinal system of the Apostle, but aims at giving a portrait of his life, (a "Charakterbild," after the plan of Schenkel's "Charakterbild Jesu.") The author denies the authenticity of the Epistles to Titus and the first Epistle to Timotheus. The Epistle to the Ephesians is, according to his opinion, an Epistle to the Laodiceans, which has been revised by another hand. The second Epistle to Timotheus he regards an enlarged edition of a Pauline epistle.

The Christology of the New Testament, (*Christologie des Neuen Testaments*. Berlin, 1866,) by Prof. Beyschlag, of Halle, is a new attempt to explain the character and mission of Christ in a manner differing from the established doctrines of the Christian Church. The author repudiates any sympathy with Strauss, Schenkel, and other representatives of heterodox theology; but his own attempt has been by no means satisfactory to the orthodox schools.

## FRANCE.

A valuable contribution to the history of metaphysical speculation is furnished in the work of M. de Margerie, entitled, Theodicy: Essays on God, Creation, and Providence, (*Theodicée. Etudes sur Dieu, la Creation, et la Providence*. Paris: 1866.) The author declares himself to be a Christian philosopher; his aim is to reconcile reason with faith, and he seeks to attack error under its various forms, in the name of the intellect and the heart combined.

A new work against modern "Spiritualism" has been published by J. B. Dissandier, (*Des Sciences Occultes et du Spiritisme*. Paris. 1866.) After a short preface on the occult sciences in general, the author gives an interesting account of the origin and progress of magnetism, traces the rise of spiritualism from the extraordinary impulse given to physical science, and, in conclusion, contests the claims of spiritualism either as a religion or a system of philosophy.

The "Philosophy of Thomas Brown" is the subject of a work by F. Rithoré, (*Critique de la Philosophie de Thomas Brown*. Paris. 1866.) Rithoré especially commends the Scotch metaphysician for having thoroughly understood what he considers to be the true fundamental proposition of metaphysics, namely, first, that the study of the human mind is a separate, distinct, and well-defined science; and, secondly, that our ideas and sentiments are nothing else but the thinking substance itself, variously modified.

Mr. Charles Charpentier has begun the publication of a series of twelve *brochures*, which are intended to form, when complete, a course of studies on comparative legislation. The first one, which has recently made its appearance, discusses the right of property claimed by man over man; or, in other words, the question of slavery. The author traces the history of this assumed right in pagan antiquity and among the Hebrews, and finally, vindicates to Christianity the glory of having restored to man his real dignity.

The great work of M. Albert de Broglie, of the French Academy, on The Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century, (*L'Eglise et l'Empire au quatrieme siecle*,) has just been completed by the appearance of the fifth and sixth volumes. M. A. de Broglie is, with his friend Count Montalembert, one of the chiefs of that school of French Roman Catholics who, while firmly adhering to the doctrines of their Church, yet believe in and labor for a full reconciliation be-

tween their Church and modern civilization. Like all the prominent men of this school, M. de Broglie is an admirer of the institutions of the United States, and one of the most active members of the French Society for the aid of the freedmen. The work on the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century has, from the publication of the first volume, secured a place among the master works of the historic literature of France, and the first four volumes have already gone through four editions. The two last volumes, (fifth and sixth,) just published, embrace the time from 364 to 395, beginning with the reign of Valens and ending with the death of Theodosius. Among the great names whose history is given in these two volumes are Basil, Augustine, and Theodosius; and among the most notable ecclesiastical events of the period is the Council of Constantinople.

The literature on the Life of Jesus has received a new and very valuable addition by a new work from E. de Pressensé, (*Jesus Christ, son Temps, La Vie, son Œuvre.* Paris. 1866.) The author has long had the reputation of being one of the foremost representatives of the evangelical school in the province of the theological science, not only in France, but in all Europe; and his new work, we doubt not, will rank among the most important works of the almost innumerable literature on this important subject.

The Roman Catholic literature of France, on the restoration of monastic orders on French soil since the beginning of the nineteenth century, is very numerous, and furnishes, on the whole, the best material for a knowledge of these institutions that can be derived from Roman Catholic sources. The latest contribution to this class of literature is a History of the Oratory, well known as one of the most literary organizations of French monks, by the Oratorian, A. Perraud. (*L' Oratoire de France.* Paris. 1866.) The work is divided into three parts, of which the first traces the history of the Oratory up to the French Revolution; the second is composed of the biographies of the most celebrated Oratorians; and the third is occupied with the re-establishment of the Order in 1852, and its canonical approbation in 1864.

Of the Collection of Christian Inscriptions in Gaul, prior to the eighth century, by E. Leblaud, (*Inscriptions Chrétiennes.* Paris. 1866,) vol. 2, has recently been published.

The History of the Catholic Doctrine during the first three centuries of the Church, and until the Council of Nice, by Bishop Ginoulhiac, of Grenoble, (*Histoire du Dogme Catholique.* Paris. 1865, 3 vols.,) has appeared in a second edition.

Abbé Freppel has an undisputed claim to be classed among the ablest Roman Catholic writers on ancient church history. In addition to his former valuable works on *Les Pères Apostoliques*, (1 vol.,) *Les Apologistes Chrétiens*, (2 vols..) *Saint-Irenée*, (1 vol..) *Tertullien*, (2 vols.,) he has recently published two more installments of his "Lectures of Sacred Eloquence;" namely, a work on St. Cyprian and the African Church of the third century, (*St. Cyprien*, 1 vol. Paris. 1866,) and another on Clement of Alexandria, (*Clément d'Alexandrie*, 1 vol. Paris. 1866.)

---

## Art. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, January, 1866. (Philadelphia.) 1. Sustentation Fund. 2. Common Schools. 3. The Patristic Doctrine on the Eucharist. 4. Horace Mann. 5. Imperfect Rights and Obligations as Related to Church Discipline. 6. Strauss and Schleiermacher. 7. Renan, Strauss, and Schleiermacher.

Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1866. (Andover, Mass.) 1. Intuitive Ideas, and their Relation to Knowledge. 2. Conversion, Its Nature. 3. Political Economy and the Christian Ministry. 4. The Catholic Apostolic Church.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, January, 1866. (Dover, N. H.) 1. The Relation of the Gospel to Man's Intellectual and Practical Life. 2. Unity in Doctrine. 3. Encouragements to Faith. 4. The Religious Enjoyments of Thomas Walsh. 5. Sketch of the Late Rev. A. W. Avery. 6. Rationalism and Revelation.

New Englander, January, 1866. (New Haven, Conn.) 1. Country Life in England. 2. Review of Dr. Draper's New Book, "Thoughts on the Future Civil Policy of America." 3. Lord Derby and Professor Arnold on Homer. 4. Expository Preaching. 5. Samuel Fisk. 6. Sabbath School Instruction. 7. Government in the United States. 8. Sheol; Hades; The Invisible State. 9. The Late President Wayland. 10. The Reformation of the South.

## *English Reviews.*

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, January, 1866. (London.) 1. Rome and the Romans. 2. Development of the Ancient Catholic Hierarchy. 3. Arithmetical Criticism. 4. Historiography, Ancient and Modern. 5. Unitarian Annals. 6. The Incarnation: Was it Necessary apart from the Existence of Sin? 7. Isaac Taylor. 8. The Culdean Church. 9. The Rev. C. H. Spurgeon.

British Quarterly Review, January, 1866. (London.) 1. Richard Cobden. 2. Epidemics. 3. Miss Berry, her Friends and her Times. 4. Sinai. 5. Lord Palmerston. 6. Religion in London. 7. Inductive Theology. 8. The New Parliament.

Christian Remembrancer, January, 1866. (London.) 1. Mr. Babbage. 2. Female Education. 3. Free Worship and Free Offering. 4. Friendism; its Rise, Progress, and Decline. 5. Miss Berry's Journals and Correspondence. 6. Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon. 7. English Hexameters. 8. Leckey's History of Rationalism.

Edinburgh Review. January, 1866. (New York: reprint.) 1. Modern Fresco Painting. 2. The Youth of Cardinal Mazarin. 3. Public Galleries and Irresponsible Boards. 4. An Economist of the Fourteenth Century. 5. Recent Changes in the Art of War. 6. Boner's Transylvania. 7. Was Shakspeare a Roman Catholic? 8. Corn and Cattle. 9. The Erckmann Chatrian Novels. 10. Mary Tudor, and Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. 11. Extension of the Franchise.

London Quarterly Review, January, 1866. (New York: reprint.) 1. Livingstone's Zambesi and its Tributaries. 2. Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. 3. Tennison's Enoch Arden. 4. M. Saint-Beuve. 5. Grote's Plato. 6. Miss Berry's Memoirs. 7. Palgrave's Arabia. 8. Caricature and Grotesque in Literature and Art. 9. The Coming Session.

Westminster Review, January, 1865. (New York: reprint.) 1. John Stuart Mill on the Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton. 2. Precursors of the French Revolution, Saint-Pierre and D'Argenson. 3. Lord Palmerston. 4. Coleridge's Writings. 5. Physiological Experiments, Vivisection. 6. The Polish Insurrection of 1863. 7. Dr. Livingstone's Recent Travels.

## *German Reviews.*

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) Second Number, 1866.—1. DIESTEL, Bible and Natural Science in the Times of Orthodoxy. 2. WEISS, The Petrine Question. 3. MOLLER, Juan Valdes's Divine Meditations. 4. KOSTLIN, The Marburg Articles and the Relation of Baptism and Faith. 6. PAUL, The Time of the Lord's Supper according to John. *Reviews.* 1. RITSCHL, Moller's History of Cosmology in the Greek Church until Origen. 2. SACK, Auberlen's Divine Revelation. 3. BECK, Leibbrand's Prayer for the Dead in the Evangelical Church. 4. KRUMMER, Newly-discovered Sources of Hussite History. 5. WEISS, Reply to Schenkel.

The history of Italian Protestantism in the sixteenth century has recently derived a new interest from the revival of Protestantism since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy, in 1859. A number of works from and on the leaders of this Protestant movement in Italy at the time of the Reformation have been published. Of the former class the little book on "The Benefit of Christ," which had long been regarded as lost, but was rediscovered in Cambridge, England, in 1855, is best known. It has been published in English, both in England and in the United States, in a German translation by Tischendorf, in a French translation by Bonnet. It is generally ascribed to Aonio Paleario, whose life has been made the subject of a special work by M. Young, (*The Life and Times of Aonio Paleario, or a History of the Italian Reformers in the Sixteenth Century*, 2 vols. London. 1860.) The substance of another prominent Protestant work of that time is given in the third article of the above number of the *Studien*. The author, Juan Valdes, was a twin brother of Alonzo Valdes, who, at the court of the Emperor Charles V., defended Erasmus against the wrath of the monks; and, in 1530, accompanied the emperor to Augsburg as "Private Secretary." Juan Valdes, during the time from 1530 to 1540, exercised a powerful influence on a circle of men and women of the highest social position at Naples. His chief work is entitled "One Hundred and Ten Divine Meditations." The Spanish original is lost. An Italian translation, by Vergerio, was published, in 1550, at Basil, by Curione, and has recently been republished at Halle, Germany, by E. Böhmer, (*Le Cento e dieci divine considerazioni*, Halle, 1860,) who added to it critical notes, and a biographical notice of the two brothers Valdes. Böhmer also ascribes to Juan Valdes a work recently found in the Wolfenbüttel Library, and entitled *Lac Spirituale*, (published by F. Koldewerg at Brunswick, 1864.) The Wolfenbüttel manuscript gives it as a work of Vergerio.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal of Historic Theology.) Second Number, 1866.—1. Preface by Dr. KAHNIS. 2. Dr. GOLDHORN, Abelard's principal dogmatic works, "*Tractatus de Unitate et Trinitate*" and "*Theologia.*" 3. The Suabian Confession, (*Liber Tubingensis.*) Published for the first time from a Wolfenbüttel manuscript by H. HACHFELD. 4. Extracts from the Letters of Balthasar Schuppius.

Since the sudden death of Professor Niedner, of Berlin, the Historio-Theological Society of Leipsic has elected Professor Kahnis its president, and editor of its organ, the Journal for Historical Theology. In the preface to the above number, Professor Kahnis informs the members of the Society that their organ is far from being self-supporting, and is every year a loss to the publisher. He hopes for a more active co-operation of the Society to establish their organ on a safe basis.

## *French Reviews.*

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*October* 15, 1865.—2. CARO, The Philosophy of Goethe. Goethe and Spinoza. 3. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America. 6. BERTRAND, D'Alembert, His Life and His Works. 7. QUINET, The Republic and the Convention.

*November* 1.—3. D'AVRIL, The Arabic Peninsula during the last Hundred Years. The Wahabites, The Turks, The Egyptians in the Peninsula, The Dangers of Arabic Society. 5. CARO, The Philosophy of Goethe. His Scientific Labors, Goethe and Geoffroy St. Hilaire. 6. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America. 7. RENAN, The Religious Exegesis and the French Mind.

*November* 15.—1. E. DE LAVELEYE, Popular Instruction in the Nineteenth Century. Popular Instruction in American Schools. 2. CARO, The Philosophy of Goethe. His Views of God, Nature, and Human Destiny. 4. J. DE LASTEYRIE, Ireland in the Fifth Century, The Origin of Fenianism. 11. J. DE CAZAUX, The Affairs of La Plata in 1865.

*December* 1.—2. TAINE, Italy and Italian Life. 3. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE. The Presidential Election at Chicago. 4. ST. MARC GIRARDIN, The Origin of the Eastern Question. 5. E. BURNOUF, An Essay on Religious History, The Origin of Christianity according to Ernest de Bunsen.

*December* 15.—1. ESQUIROS, England and English Life. Religious Life in the Cities. 3. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America. 6. L. DE VOEL CASTEL, Modern Mind in History, with special regard to the work of M. Rosueew St. Hilaire.

*Janvary* 1, 1866.—4. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in England. 5. JULES SIMON, Co-operative Societies in France and England. 7. E. DE LAVELEYE, Popular Instruction in the Nineteenth Century. England and the English Colonies.

*Janvary* 15.—1. TAINE, Italy and Italian Life. 2. E. PELLETAU, Proudhon and his Complete Works. 6. E. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America. 7. JANET, History of Philosophy and Eclecticism.

## Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*Beginning Life.* Chapters for our Young Men on Religion, Study, and Business. By John Tulloch, D.D., Principal and Primarius Professor of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, Author of "The Leaders of the Reformation," etc. 12mo., pp. 296. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1866.

One of the greatest moral achievements for the Church of the present day is to provide a pure Christian literature for our young men, and then to induce them to read it. Dr. Wiley has in the present volume supplied a noble contribution to this great work. Principal Tulloch is one of the purest and most eloquent religious writers of Britain at the present hour, and the present work exhibits some of the best traits of his lucid pen. It is an excellent guide for the young man in attaining a happy Christian character and life. Let every young man under the influence of our Church obtain this work, or his parent for him, and let him read and re-read a portion of it every Sabbath, until it has become a part of his own mind, and he will have possessed himself of a large element of the truest Christian manhood. The work is furnished by our Western Concern with a most attractive material embodiment.

---

### *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Vom Zustande nach dem Tode.* Biblische Untersuchungen mit Berücksichtigung der einschlägigen alten und neuen Literatur. Von Heinrich Wilh. Rinck, Pastor zu Eberfeld. Ludwigsburg und Basil. 8vo., pp. 382. 2 Auflage, 1866.

The above eschatological work was first issued in 1861, and as it has now been called for in a new edition, it seems to have some claim upon a notice in these pages. It treats in different chapters, with various subordinate divisions, of Death and the Intermediate State, of the Resurrection of the Flesh, of the Final Judgment, of Heaven and the State of the Perfected, of Hell and the State of the Damned, and, finally, of the Heavenly Jerusalem. As regards the Intermediate State our author denies the *purgatorial* view of it which several of the Lutheran theologians of our day teach, preferring the view according to which the regenerate *ripen* for heaven, and the unregenerate for hell, until the day of judgment, at which time the souls of the righteous will have become morally fitted for the glorified state, while those of the wicked will, by continued

obstinacy and rebellion, have made themselves guilty of the "sin against the Holy Ghost," and therefore liable to the just retribution of eternal punishment. As a natural consequence he does not agree with *Richard Rothe*, *Kern*, *Kling*, *Rudloff*, *Frantz*, *Stirm*, *Leibrand*, and the *Silesian Consistorium of the Evangelical Church of Prussia*, in recommending prayers for the dead. On the other hand he holds, with most German divines, that Christ preached to the antediluvians in Hades, and provided for a continued proclamation of his Gospel there to all who should go thither from the *heathen* world down to the end of time. He also agrees with the Wirtemberg theosophers in ascribing to the dead in the intermediate state the possession of a temporary body. Apart from the "first" and the "general" resurrection he believes in a continually progressing resurrection of individuals, in proof of which he brings us two "authenticated facts." The first is drawn from the life of *Oetinger*. It seems that Oetinger had a pious friend whose strong faith and power in prayer were very remarkable. More than once his prayers lifted a burden from Oetinger's soul when everything else had failed to bring relief. His name was Rieger, and he was commander of the little military post on the Hohenasberg, at present a state prison. "Now it came to pass," says our author, "that this hero of the Asberg died and was buried in or near the church. About a year later it became necessary to set a pillar exactly where the grave was located. Already they had opened a new grave, to which the remains of the Asberger were to be transferred. The grave-diggers proceed to raise the well-preserved coffin, but find it so remarkably light that from curiosity they open it. Not a trace of the body of the large man! No sooner, however, did Father Oetinger hear of it than he exclaimed: "What? Does that excite your wonder? Have ye never read of the first resurrection? Very well, to this first resurrection our *commandant* has attained, for his spirit, soul, and body were sanctified wholly and filled with the spirit of grace!"

The other instance occurred in the parish of the pious old Father *Spleiss* at Buch. One Saturday evening, just as the old gentleman was going to church, the sexton, in digging a new grave, lighted upon an old coffin, whose decayed lid was cut through by his spade. "The man bends down to treat it as carefully as possible, and to remove the inclosed remains; not a bone, not a trace of a corpse is there! Nothing but a milk basin, such as it is the custom to place over the bouquet laid upon the coffins of the unmarried, and this had just fallen through the decayed lid!" Our naive

author assures us that Mrs. Spleiss was among the witnesses whom the sexton called together to attest the astonishing fact; that Father Spleiss would have been another had he not been obliged to hold the evening service; that the whole matter was "accurately investigated" by an "official," and that the assertion of the sexton was "perfectly confirmed." It was finally ascertained that a very pious girl had been interred just here some years before, and the conclusion to which the good people came was, that here was a case of one who had attained the first resurrection. With this conclusion our sage author agrees, and gives us the instance, as a "proof from experience," of the reality of an ever-progressing resurrection. Who cannot appreciate the gusto with which his medical readers will pencil upon the margin a wicked *Q. E. D.!*

After the above specimen of our author's charming simplicity, we fear our readers will have little relish for further particulars. We will therefore only remark in general, that the book betrays considerable familiarity with the later eschatological literature of Germany, and contains many well-selected citations from esteemed authors. As to the author's own contribution, it is shallow, fantastic, often theosophical, betraying neither a thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, nor even sound common sense. Perhaps no department of Protestant theology stands in greater need of a thorough revision, in the light of Holy Scripture and of modern anthropology, than just this; but such works as the above can only *indirectly* serve the good cause by calling forth others of a more truly scientific character.

---

*Erläuterungen des Evangeliums St. Johannis.* 12mo., pp. 405. Berlin: Wiegandt. 1866.

A delectable little commentary on the Gospel of St. John. The author, who withholds his name, assures us in the preface that the work was written solely for personal edification, and that it is given to the public only in compliance with the urgent solicitation of friends to whom its existence had become known. The excuse for publication is an old one, but doubtless for once accordant with fact. The book bears strong internal evidence of such an origin as that assigned it, and on the whole inclines us to the opinion, that it would be well if all commentators would write a little more for themselves and a little less for the dear reader. There is a freshness of thought, an insight in spiritual things, a familiarity with the so-called "Johannean" phase of Christian doctrine and life, a penetration into the subtilest "association of ideas," which betray more than a mere study of the beloved disciple—namely, a

natural affinity of soul and experience. The author evidently wrote *con amore*, and not for filthy lucre. The dogmatic undertone of the book is decidedly Lutheran, but it seldom if ever becomes offensively audible. Text and observations are woven into one typographical texture, the former being distinguished from the latter only by quotation marks. In the foot-notes one finds a choice anthology selected from Luther, Quesnel, Anton, and other favorites of the author. Notwithstanding the purely practical and edificatory design of the writer, he does not hesitate to quietly correct the authorized Lutheran version where it fails to bring out the full sense of the evangelist, and even to omit the first eleven verses of the eighth chapter as ungenuine. Unpretending as the little work is, it will refresh and quicken many. It is one of the few books which will be read by high and low, learned and unlearned, with equal pleasure and with equal profit.

It occurs to us just here to remind our readers that the house which issues this commentary published about four years ago a large collection of the *Sermons of F. W. Krummacher*, (three volumes.) Brought out thus just after the outbreak of our war but few copies found their way to the United States, and indeed few learned of their publication at all. Whoever is acquainted with the eloquent court preacher's "Elijah the Tishbite" (and in America who is not?) will need no further introduction to his collected *Predigten*.

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*Spiritualism Identical with Ancient Sorcery, New Testament Demonology, and Modern Witchcraft*, with the Testimony of God and Man against it. By W. M'Donald. 12mo., pp. 212. New York: Carlton & Porter.

It cannot be doubted that a great change has been forced upon the public mind during the last thirty years in regard to the reality of apparent supernatural phenomena. So numerous are the well-attested statements of sensible facts, that no skeptic, no savan who has attempted to take them in hand, has been able to so manage them with creditable success as to place them to the public mind in clear consistency with the old Saddusaic skepticism of the days of the Locke and Hobbes philosophy. Shall we deny, it is asked, the truth of the statements of the sensible facts? Most persons will have no respect for the judgment that denies the truth of the narrative of the phenomena occurring in the Wesley

family; of the clairvoyant perceptions related by the philosopher Kant in regard to Swedenborg; of the appearance of the deceased father of the Duke of Buckingham, as narrated by Lord Clarendon; of the phenomena occurring in the house of Rev. Mr. Perreaud, to which the philosopher Robert Boyle gave his credence, and of which Mr. Wesley says, "I do not think any unprejudiced men can doubt of the truth of this narrative." The cheap philosophers who either with a broad grin would sneer at these facts, or with a solemn scientific "gravity would make you split," would ignore without explaining them, may be safely reckoned as ciphers in the equation against Wesley, Kant, Clarendon, and Boyle. And when we have admitted even these instances, the doctrine of Hume, Baden Powell, M. Comte, M. Renan, and the whole school, that no supernatural phenomena ever crosses our human experience, is at once at an end. Their pretended negative law of experience is contradicted by the positive facts of experience. It follows, also, if these particular instances are admitted, that while we are still justified in rejecting all other narratives not based on the most irrefragable evidence, yet numerous instances of the kind do truly occur, and when well attested, it is a skepticism running into credulity that rejects them. It then follows that a spirit-world does exist; the soul survives the body; the demoniacs of the New Testament are a reality, and we are not shut in to fruitless metaphysics, unsustained by actual facts, to prove the truth of our higher nature to the mind that doubts the Scriptures.* No sharp criterion line can indeed be drawn between the credible and incredible, just as no such division line exists in the ordinary events of life. And so in the mass of modern spiritualistic phe-

* Mr. Wesley expresses very decided, perhaps extreme, opinions upon this point: "It is true, likewise, that the English in general, and indeed most of the men of learning in Europe, have given up all accounts of witches and apparitions as mere old wives' fables. I am sorry for it; and I willingly take this opportunity of entering my solemn protest against this violent compliment, which so many that believe the Bible pay to those who do not believe it. I owe them no such service. I take knowledge that these are at the bottom of the outcry which has been raised, and with such insolence spread throughout the nation, in direct opposition, not only to the Bible, but to the suffrages of the wisest and best of men in all ages and nations. They well know (whether Christians know it or not) that the giving up of witchcraft (the operation of malignant or infernal influence) is, in effect, giving up the Bible; and they know, on the other hand, that *if but one account of the intercourse of men with separate spirits be admitted, their whole castle in the air (Deism, Atheism, Materialism) falls to the ground.* I know no reason, therefore, why we should suffer even this weapon to be wrested out of our hands. Indeed, there are numerous arguments besides which abundantly confute their vain imaginations."

nomena, while a fraction of actually supernatural or rather subternatural facts may be admitted, it is easily seen that that class of facts may be used as a nucleus upon which a set of profligate jugglers may superimpose an indefinite amount of trickery. For us, on account of such jugglery, to reject the clearest facts attested by unimpeachable witnesses where no deception can exist, is, in fact, to make ourselves the victim of that jugglery.

Our biblical thinkers, perhaps, as Wesley thinks, make a mistake in not recognizing the illustration which this modern spiritism, or rather demonism, sheds upon the demonology, sorcery, and witchcraft of both the Old and New Testaments. Mr. M'Donald has shown how striking is the accordance. And it thus appears that in all our human history the powers above and the powers below have ever been manifesting themselves to human perceptions. There is a whole system of divine manifestation, appearing in the angels, the seers, the prophets, and the sacred writers, culminating in the incarnation, as recorded in the Holy Records retained by the true Church. And by the light of these same records we descry a lower antithetical order of manifested beings, the sorcerers, the dealers with familiar spirits, the demoniacs, culminating in the visible appearance of Satan at the temptation. Thus earth is the battle-ground of the supernal and the infernal, disclosing themselves by glimpses, yet disclosing themselves too palpably and too perpetually to be ignored or reasonably denied.

'Though a sharp line cannot, as we have said, be infallibly drawn, dividing the truth from fiction, yet a constant line may be drawn to regulate our credence, separating the credible from the incredible, and in fact shutting off the large mass of narratives into the incredible. We are not then liable to the objection that if you admit anything you must admit the whole, and are thus precipitated into a boundless credulity. If, for instance, a man, however sensible, shall tell us he had seen a ghost, we should question the soundness of his health and advise him to consult his physician; for nothing is more settled than the occurrence of such hallucinations from a disordered system. If a sensible man should tell us that the ghost not only appeared but conversed with him, the case would be stronger, being sustained by two bodily senses. But if the apparition discloses to one man an important fact, unknown to the living world, but found on investigation to be true, there could be no solution which does not admit of communication from a mind disconnected with a material body. When in addition, as in the case related by Clarendon, the apparition appears repeatedly in the same manner, communicates the

unknown fact to authenticate his reality, and furnishes as the main object of his appearing a prediction of a future fact, incalculable by the human intellect, yet strangely verified in an immediate future, there can be no rational doubting that the apparition was actual, and that a genuine revelation was received from a disembodied spirit. There are, indeed, very few cases thus amply authenticated; and therefore the great mass of such narratives may be wisely rejected, not as always being certainly *untrue*, but as being most certainly *not proved*. Different minds will draw the line with different degrees of stringency.

But if we admit demoniac manifestation, how shall we distinguish the supernal from the infernal, the miracle from the lying wonder? Just as you distinguish the firmament above from the black earth beneath. Just as you distinguish a good, holy man from a lying, profligate debauchee. Just as you distinguish the holy Church of all ages with its Holy Scriptures from the followers of sin, death, and hell in the world. Adhere by faith, prayer, and holiness to the good, to truth, to God, and you belong to the Supernal. Consort with the sorcerer, the necromancer, the medium, the leaguer with demons, and you go with the Infernal. And here the Holy Scriptures are our chart and guide. The Church of God with its central Son of God is the one great organic miracle; all antithetical to that belongs to the demoniac.

How truly the modern spiritism terminates in clear, unmistakable demonism, this work of Mr. M'Donald, and the volume by Dr. Hatch, elsewhere noticed, most amply demonstrate. Mr. M'Donald narrates the first appearance of the developments of our day in the Fox family, in 1848. He enumerates the twelve different kinds of mediums, with some of their evidences and claims. He then traces the same phenomena, essentially, through history, sacred and secular, ancient and modern. He shows the identity of the so-called "Spiritualism" of our day with the various forms of sorcery and diabolism of past ages. He exhibits the clear accordance of this identification with the Bible view, and the striking illustration thence derived of Scripture truth. He furnishes some of the most decisive instances in modern times of supernatural manifestation. Finally, he traces the awful demoralization to which this modern sorcery tends, to doctrines the most detestable, to devil-worship, to all lasciviousness and uncleanness. For an illustration of both the reality and the depravity of the system the book is very effective. Some of our Churches have, we believe, in former times, been infested with these damnable nuisances; and to their pastors we recommend an examination of these pages.

*The Constitution of Man, Physically, Morally, and Spiritually Considered;* or, The Christian Philosopher. By B. F. Hatch, M.D. 8vo., pp. 654. New York: 1866.

Dr. Hatch was originally a Universalist minister; but being converted to Spiritualism became an active propagator of that *ism* until, revolted by its moral abominations, he forsook that dark confederacy. He seems to conclude that he brings from the things he there learned the means of attaining and revealing to men higher truths. With him the infernal is spiritualism, the true supernal is a sort of Swedenborgianism. By the lights he has possessed he draws out what he esteems a discovery surpassing that of the Newtonian law of gravitation, a science of the cosmos. The central element of this science is not merely *duality*, but a universal *sexuality*. The sexual distinction reigns not only in the human, the animal and vegetable worlds, but through the mineral, the imponderable, the spiritual; having its basis in the duality of goodness and wisdom in Jehovah. By this are explained God, creation, man, and nature; and from these are deduced those great laws of true monogamy, by which man may attain purity, holiness, and true blessedness of existence.

The book itself is rather a *duality*. It singularly blends vigor of thought with unwisdom of opinions. It has many passages attaining eloquence; while violations of grammar, and misuse and misshape of words, betray defective training in elementary English. It is written in the interests of virtue, and yet a pure mind experiences a sense of demoralization in studying its pages. In his great discovery of a new fundamental law of things, Dr. Hatch sustains about the same relation to Newton as Captain Symmes does to Columbus. The great value of his work consists in its thorough exposure of the depths of iniquity of the modern sorcery. A most ample reason is shown, in the downward tendency to the deepest possibilities of depravity of the whole system, doctrine, and practice, for the imprecation of God's word against the sorceries of old. Here is indeed revealed the great moral *duality*, the intense and awful antithesis between the celestial and the infernal, between the glorious firmament above and the boundless quagmire below. It was, we may safely conclude, upon such an accursed brood as Dr. Hatch describes that Jude, in his day, sent his fiery thunderbolt of an inspired epistle. Dr. Hatch, like St. Jude, tasks the powers of language to describe the utterly abominable; and the traits of the two descriptions attest the identity of the common object. We give a few statements of facts:

There are four hundred public mediums and spiritual lecturers in the Northern section of the United States. Not less than three hundred of these have been married; two hundred of which have been legally divorced in consequence of their own pernicious conduct; all of whom, so far as I have been able to learn, are living in promiscuous commerce. Those who continue to cohabit as husband and wife, it is usually with the tacit or verbal understanding that they are to have their affinity with whom there shall be no restraint of association. This latter condition prevails more generally where both parties are mediums. Such as have not been married, are living in the exercise of the broadest freedom with both married and single. I have not been able to learn of more than two exceptions to this horrid state of things, and of these I have too little knowledge of the facts to justify me in expressing any opinion in their favor. . . .

Men and women who are lost to all shame, and of whom it is well known that they have repeatedly been guilty, not merely of prostitutional and other vicious habits, but of such crimes as would have justly incarcerated them in the penitentiary, are put forward as the leading men and women among them. At all their gatherings we find them elected as chairmen of their meetings, appointed committees, and most lauded speakers. The more intensely wicked they become, as they are thus freed from the conventionalisms of the age, the better qualified they are deemed to be for these positions. And it is a fact which they have confessedly learned by experience, that the more their mediums give themselves up to the indulgence of every lustful desire, the more completely are they controlled by their familiar spirits, and the more fluent, sophistical, and interesting they become to their hearers.—P. 645.

Others have freely offered their own daughters to become the mistresses of men, averring that marriage should not precede, but follow, that intimate relation belonging to husband and wife; that after they have lived together sufficiently long to ascertain whether each can fully respond to all the desires of the other, is then the proper time to decide on marriage.—P. 643.

We have elsewhere expressed the belief that Swedenborg possessed, during some part of his life, a preternatural clairvoyant faculty. It was simply a physiological peculiarity, of the nature of disease, tending, even in his great brain, to insanity. By it he was able to discern actual material realities through distant space, and, perhaps, actual realities in the region of bodiless spirits. By this last endowment he was a necromancer, that is, a converser with the dead. It is very possible that some of the statements he makes touching the departure of soul from body, and its subsequent conditions in the intermediate state, possess some traits of truth. It is equally true that a large body of his supernatural details and dogmas are contradicted by established science, by common sense, or by Scripture. In his healthy condition he was a great philosopher, and much of his philosophy was true beyond his age. In his preternatural condition he was a mystic, peering into the invisible, where his perceptions, sometimes true, wandered and were lost in twilight and vagary. He had no real revelation, for a revelation is *from above to man;* whereas Swedenborg's clairvoyance was from man below, upward, "intruding into things not seen." It was earthly in origin and illegitimate in direction. Ethically he was a virtuous man, but spiritually he seems not a pious man. Prayer but slightly belonged either to his theory or prac-

tice. He authenticated his mission by no miracles of power. Hence his whole system is not so much a religion as a philosophy and a pneumatology, or doctrine of spiritual existences. The virtue and mental elevation of Swedenborg, like those of Judge Edmonds, were too high to be dragged down to the dark depths of the modern sorcery; but, even in Swedenborg, there are some tainted streaks of sensual sexual tendency, showing the natural direction in which these preternatural excitements run. They become successively "earthly, sensual, devilish."

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*The Pilgrim's Wallet;* Or, Scraps of Travel Gathered in England, France, and Germany. By GILBERT HAVEN. 12mo., pp. 492. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

Mr. Haven made the tour of Europe and Palestine at what date is not said, except that he commenced "on board steamer Canada, five o'clock A. M.," and ends somewhere in Holland under the "shadow of the Cross" at an o'clock unmentioned. Between these two ambiguous standpoints he narrates his visits to England, France, Germany, and Holland, in the present volume; reserving Switzerland and Palestine for a possible future book, whose publication mainly depends upon the success of his first effort, a condition which we are gratified to say is no longer a contingency.

Mr. Haven made his first conspicuous debut before the public in the pages of our Quarterly, called out by the invitation of its present editor soon after his assumption of office, and very soon attracted the attention of our denominational public. His successive articles, by their strong individualism, have ever attracted very decided favorable or adverse notice. In the periodicals of our own and other denominations he has been a copious writer. Called out by his intense interest in the great leading humanitarian movements of the day, he has written several unbound volumes of racy and sometimes brilliant production. From haste, and sometimes from peculiarity of taste and judgment, his productions have been commingled streaks of success and failure, of forced rhetoric and of genuine eloquence and power. But we are happy to say that in the present volume such have been the time, care, and judgment expended upon the work, that its true power and brilliancy are sustained with unfaltering success from end to end. So clearly is this the case, that with rare and explicable exceptions without our Church, and with a single equally explicable exception within

our Church, it has been received with a unanimity of applause by our critical periodicals of all sects and classes.

This volume, so far as mastery of language, wide range of literature, vivid allusive fancy, and graphic topographical and historical description are concerned, places the author at the head of the writers of our Church. Books there are in our denominational library of more permanent status, from their theological or historical value, but none that have called into play or have so clearly demonstrated the existence of so varied powers of thought and style. And yet from the very transient nature of the subject of the book it can possess no lasting life. It is momentary in its quality. We read it with a regret pervading our pleasure that such powers of insight and combination of thought, and such vividness and accuracy of language, should be wasted in fringing an ephemeron with splendor. If the author should pass away he would at present have left a vivid impress upon the memory of contemporaries who appreciate his powers and character; but no memento with life in itself, imaging in itself the powers and character of the author, to prove that *mentis forma est eterna.* The very enthusiasm of his nature which has prompted his pen has absorbed his attention to the immediate present. He has yet to produce his gift to the future.

Mr. Haven's pages bear honorable traces of his inflexible trueness to his convictions. Both in Europe and before the literary world at home, he is unshrinkingly Christian, Protestant, American, Wesleyan. Those who doubt whether, with all his uniqueness, Mr. Haven is to be trusted with the high responsibilities of the Church to which his talents entitle him, have amplest assurance that to all her principles she has no truer son. He has a faith which he is ready to brave the world in asserting, in her doctrines, her historic past, her grand future. We trust that still maturer experience will soften those over-salient points in his character, and induce the Church that loves his pure, genial, and noble nature to repose full trust in his conservative wisdom. We make some specimen extracts from his pages.

*Pen Sketches of London Preachers.*—

Trench, then Dean of Westminster, frequently preached at the Abbey. This elegant scholar has but little appearance of elegance in his address. He is a large-framed man, above the middle height, with large features, and a coarse bushy head of hair. His voice is harsh and his manners boisterous; the very opposite of what one would have expected from his writings. But he was intensely in earnest. He seemed tied down by his notes, and struggled as a lion in a net between his parchment and his gown. His subject was Ezekiel's vision, having reference to Whit-Sunday, or the day of Pentecost. His language had his usual force, finish, and

sincerity. He impressed me as being greatly burdened for souls. He is said to be an indefatigable worker, and the crowds drawn to the Abbey could not have been more faithfully dealt with.

By rare fortune I heard Dr. Cumming that same evening on the same text: there the similitude ended. In matter, manner, everything except the unity of the Spirit, they are totally unlike. The Doctor is tallish, slim, very genteel, nice to softness in voice and manner, pronouncing exquisite "exsqueeseete," and such-like Miss Nancy-isms. Yet the dandy glove hides a grip of steel. He, more than any one I have heard, discussed doctrinal questions. This was probably owing to his Scotch training and auditory. He referred to the "Essays and Reviews," denouncing them for their laxity on the question of inspiration. His subject was the universal triumph of Christ. His millenarian views were dwelt upon, and prophecies repeated.—Pp. 170, 171.

After all, London fame settles on two men, Punshon and Spurgeon. Arthur would divide the honors with Punshon were he well. I have heard no sermon more tender and fervent in spirit, more neat, concise, yet rich in thought, than one I had the pleasure of hearing from him on "I beheld, and lo, a Lamb in the midst of the throne, as it had been slain." From these words, with great skill, he led us step by step along the highway of the Gospel. He seemed feeble, but showed what power was his in his better days.

Punshon and Spurgeon are very different sort of men. Punshon reminded me of Bascom and Chapin. He reads fast, has but few gestures, is no orator, at least in the pulpit, and carries his crowds by the splendor of his language more than by all other gifts. He rushes with such impetuosity that you are swept along as in an express train. His subject was Jeremiah's complaint against the Jews for abandoning the living fountains and hewing out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water. Like the others, it was textual, seizing each word and showing its force and application; addressed to the unconverted persons of a Christian nation. He enlarged on the difference between the work Jeremiah and Paul had to do—one to warn, entreat, and lament a falling Church, the other to build up the Church out of the ruins of heathendom. His description of the Jews was masterly. So was his portrayal of the labor of man to save himself: hewing out to himself cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water. His sermons are exegetical orations. His house was full, and were it known where he preached, the crowds would be enormous. He ought to be advertised, unless he could have a stated place, which the Wesleyan polity forbids. He is a large, full-faced man of about forty. His voice is pleasant, but not extraordinary. His forte is in these rushing tides of gorgeous rhetoric, not overflowing, but full to the brim. Reading his sermon spoils it for oratory, but does not seem to conflict with his style, which might not be helped but marred by abandoning the manuscript. He may break away from these inky letters on the platform; if so, his sweep must be grand.—Pp. 173, 174.

*English and American Preaching.*—

I cannot call this style superior or equal to the American. Ours recognizes intellectual activities in the minds of our auditors; skepticisms, discussions, difficulties, which their spiritual guides must discourse upon. This preaching does not seem to know that there is any conflict of mind in England. It is evident from its character that the mass of hearers are orthodox, and their aim is almost entirely to make them reduce their faith to practice. The skeptical fever has reached the upper classes here. It will reach the masses when they shall become intelligent and thoughtful. Meantime the preachers and preaching in both England and America are wisely adapted to the peculiar needs of each region. Each shall bring forth their appointed work with shoutings, and Christ be all in all.—P. 176.

*An Adventure with a John Bull.*—

A herd of matronly-looking kine were grazing near by. Out of their company a thick-necked gentleman walks slowly toward me. He is the very model in looks and airs of his masters, and I see at a glance, in the midst of my terror, how appropriate is the name of Bull to a Briton. He turns not to the right hand nor

to the left. It is my turn to turn. For once, to my mortification I confess it, a Yankee had to flee from a John Bull. The Yankee had no revolver, stone, nor stick. His legs were his only weapon, and he properly put them to their proper use. A little copse was near, shut from the Sultan and his seraglio by a low and movable iron fence. He was within forty feet of me before I suspected his nature or designs, so quiet and cow-like were his movements: in this, too, strikingly conforming to the national character. I saw by his steady and slightly increasing pace, and by the directness of his aim at me, that he was not, as Hawthorn says of the bipedic British animal, "the Female Bull," but the masculine counterpart. I therefore put on his airs, the best way always to subdue a Briton, and with like outward coolness and calmness, though with a somewhat fleeter step, moved toward the low fence and protecting copse. He does not get sufficiently aroused to scale the powerless protection, and the Trent affair on the Edinburgh Grange closes, like its prototype in the "still vexed Bermoothes," with no harm to either side. Prince John returns to his dames, and I, passing through the woods, come out on the other side, cross in safety the long meadows, through a flock of noble-blooded sheep, whose lords eye me with scorn but refrain from assault, and crawling ignobly out of the hole where an hour before I had crawled in, retrace my weary steps in the evening dark, back to my quarters. I learned a lesson that proved useful in all my subsequent wanderings through the island, and that was, to keep in the old paths. Such a path, if through the grandest estates, is as old, as public, and as much protected as the highway; but a single step to the right or left is sure to bring one suddenly to grief.—Pp. 93, 94.

We hope Mr. Haven did not leave the influence of this valuable monition "to keep in the old paths" behind him in "the island." It is not out of latitude or longitude on our own continent.

Mr. Haven tells in very sprightly style how he endeavored, regardless of etiquette, to obtain an interview with Tennyson. Of course that would-be aristocrat of a poet would accept no such abdication of red tape. And some of our American critics have elevated their contemptuous probosces at this Vandal procedure of our Yankee "evangelical democrat." Such criticism, of course, evinces their own high culture. But there are gentlemen on both sides of the Atlantic, as well as snobs like Tennyson and these Miss Nancyish critics. Witness the reception given Mr. Haven upon a precisely similar frank self-introduction to the English favorite of American essay readers, the "Country Parson," A. K. H. Boyd:

Being lion-hunting, like the Nimrods in Africa, I go to the hunting-grounds. Armed only with a card and a little Yankee brass, I present myself at his door. He was living in a quiet and delightful part of the new city, in a comfortable, spacious stone house. It was long the residence of Prof. Aytoun. I send in my card, with "Boston, U. S. A.," upon it, and am immediately ushered into his presence. He very cordially welcomes me, and we forget in five minutes that we were ever strangers; at least I did. He was carefully, yet not clerically dressed. He speaks more rapidly than is usual in this country, as though he had caught our spirit with our approval. His face lights up with smiles, and his lips run over with humor.—P. 89.

Need we say which of these Englishmen was the true gentleman, Tennyson or Boyd? Or need we say which is the more genuine man, Mr. Haven or his American critic?

*War of the Rebellion;* or, Scylla and Charybdis. Consisting of Observations upon the Causes, Course, and Consequences of the late Civil War in the United States. By H. S. Foote. 12mo.

Mr. Foote writes, as he ever had the reputation of speaking, with a fluency running into volubility. Yet his book discloses an amiability and patriotism which we had hardly attributed hitherto to the man whom public reprobation had adorned with the prenominal title of "hangman." In the present volume he assures us that the violent language by which he attained that title was by himself immediately condemned, and such reparations made to Senator Hale as more than satisfied his feelings, though they never soothed the "unforgiving public." Of course Mr. Foote omits to mention that his menace was but one of a series of personal threats and assaults, both verbal and corporeal, (of which the attempted assassination of Sumner was but a specimen,) by which Southern Congressmen systematically endeavored to suppress the freedom of debate, and intimidate the North into submission. That system of violences was the actual prelude to the war. The uniformity of the southern origin of these assaults, united with the quiet firmness of northern antislavery men and the servile sycophancy of the northern servites, inspired the minds of the southern leaders with that notion of northern cowardice which prompted the rebellion that has so retributively swept them with the besom of destruction.

Mr. Foote's narrative carries us through the interesting but humiliating epoch of the compromises, especially of 1850, the era of great statesmen and small statesmanship; when a few at the head of the southern slaveholdership manipulated the northern leaders, headed by Webster, like so many pieces on the chess-board. Of all this northern humiliation the true secret was this: The North idolized the Union and the South despised it. For the Union the North was ready for any sacrifice, and accordingly the South prescribed to the North every possible disgrace, and then gave a blow intended to smite her idolized Union to fragments. The gun of Sumter restored to the North her manhood, but, alas! sealed the ruin of the South. At this hour the North is exuberant before the nations of the world in the pride of victorious wealth, and the South sits like a widow amid the desolation of a home stained with the blood of her bravest sons.

The leaders by whom the South was partly seduced and partly "precipitated" into her assault upon our nationality have gone forever under. We do not so much blame our Southern friends at the present hour for a grateful feeling of sympathy with the generals who led their arms, and were the immediate defenders of

their homes; but as to the men who headed the old slaveholding body and pushed the claims of the slave power to national dominion, and then inaugurated the civil war, no one has less reason to bless their memories than the misled and ruined South. It was their personal and corporate ambition, their dictatorial arrogance over South and North, and their wild miscalculations of the results, that "precipitated" the war. Such, in fact, was the infatuation of these men that *they intentionally divided the Democratic party for the purpose of electing Lincoln*, in order to "fire the Southern heart" to a war sure to fire the southern homes to desolation. The North has no reason to honor those men; but every reprobation the North pronounces upon them, the South has reason with tenfold emphasis to repeat.

---

*The Life of John Brainerd*, the Brother of David Brainerd, and his Successor as Missionary to the Indians of New Jersey. Par Nobile Fratrum. By Rev. THOMAS BRAINERD, D.D., Pastor of "Old Pine-street Church," Philadelphia. 12mo., pp. 492. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee. New York: A. D. F. Randolph.

In 1649 there came to America a little boy of eight years of age, attached, but not apparently related, to an affluent family of immigrants, who was as destitute of a known pedigree as ancient Melchisedec in his day, but who has become the progenitor, thus far, of more than thirty thousand ascertained American descendants. His original Norman name, Braidwood, corrupted to Brainerd, has been ennobled by the excellence and talent of a large number of inheritors, and rendered pre-eminent in the annals of modern saintship by the apostolic sanctity of *one*. From the present volume we learn that of that memorable *one* there was nearly as memorable a *duplicate*. As there were two Edwardses, father and son, of a wonderfully similar type, so of the Brainerds there were a fraternal two, David and John, brothers in spirit as well as brothers in the flesh. Hitherto John has been without his fame. Or rather we might say fame has been without him; for such men can better afford to spare the remembrance of the world, than the world can afford to lose the power of their example. But, very fittingly, he has found a biographer in one who well sustains the honors of the name. We confess some *personal* interest in the volume, from the fact that we remember a school-boy intimacy with the respected author; that it reveals to us unexpectedly our own marital connection with *the* same great Brainerd clan; and that it explains to us precisely who was owner of the title "old Father Brainerd," dimly commemorated in some of our home traditions.

John Brainerd, younger brother of David, was born in 1720; graduated at Yale, and labored most of his life either as pastor, evangelist, or Indian missionary, in New Jersey, and died in 1781. His tomb is in Deerfield, N. J.; the record of his will in Trenton. His itinerant labors have rendered the names of Crosswicks, Bethel, and Brotherton memorable. "When he died," says the biographer, "his labors were not followed up by the Presbyterians The churches he built fell into decay, or passed into the hands of the Methodists, who began to occupy the ground by their circuits and traveling preachers." Tradition in his native town says "he was as holy a man as his brother David." Though such men may not technically "profess sanctification," they so "live it" as that the world professes it for them.

Dr. Brainerd abstains from extensive authorship from no want of ability for ample success. He is master of an easy, graceful, full, flowing style. Though hereditarily Puritan in principle, he is genial and liberal in spirit; amply able to distinguish the essentials of religious rectitude from overstrained asceticism. He has added a new permanent contribution to the rich library of modern religious biography.

---

*The Women of Methodism:* its Three Foundresses, Susanna Wesley, the Countess of Huntingdon, and Barbara Heck; with Sketches of their Female Associates and Successors in the Early History of the Denomination. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. A Centenary Offering to the Women of American Methodism, from the American Methodist Ladies' Centenary Association. 12mo., pp. 304. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

In giving the feminine side of the history of Methodism Dr. Stevens has furnished a readable book. He travels over the well-beaten track, and gleans a few additional names and particulars. We have some doubt whether in a centenary of specifically Arminian Methodism, in which Calvinism bears no share and affords no co-operation, the Countess of Huntingdon should be held a co-ordinate with Mrs. Wesley and Barbara Heck. We acknowledge her eminent piety and great good works; but scarce less were the piety and works of Augustus Toplady and Rowland Hill. Lady Huntingdon ejected the sainted Fletcher from his professorship at Trevecca, and was a prime mover of the ridiculous onslaught of Shirley upon Wesley and his Conference for their Arminianism. Her proper commemorators are the bigoted Calvinistic Methodists of Wales, who are Methodist only in name. If they or their foundress were now in our country they would affiliate with the high predestinarians of Princeton and Windsor, and would acknowl-

edge no share in us, or concede us any specific share in them. Lady Huntingdon is on our catalogue of eminent saints, but not on our catalogue of Methodist saints.

---

*Social Life among the Chinese:* with some Account of their Religious, Governmental, Educational, and Business Customs and Opinions. With special but not exclusive reference to Fuhchau. By Rev. JUSTUS DOOLITTLE, fourteen years Member of the Fuhchau Mission of the American Board. With over one hundred and fifty illustrations. In two volumes. 12mo. 1865.

A full and interesting detail of the peculiarities of this quaint old race. It is well calculated to quicken the missionary interest for the millions of this vast empire, dwelling in the ghastly twilight of a godless semi-civilization, "sitting in the valley of the shadow of death."

---

## *Periodicals.*

*The Christian Advocate.* New York, January 25, 1866.

In our last Quarterly we published an article by the editor on the "Spirit of the Southern Methodist Press," in which we selected the three great leading points of "Peaceful Loyalty," "Negro Treatment," and "Church Conciliation," and furnished extracts from all the then existing Southern papers, stating their *positions* on those three points. We might have confirmed the strength of those positions by still further extracts in possession, and, as we stated, some still stronger extracts were mislaid by us and lost. But these "positions" on these three points we declared to be "*uncontradicted*" by any other passages. Not a single passage had we found varying from their standpoint. The article was necessarily brief, and did not claim to furnish all the underbrush of petulances exchanged between North and South. It expressly affirmed that, as represented by its periodical press, "each Church has its own set of ideas, *its own hostilities and charges against the other*, its own self-justifications and self-glorifications." But it selected, what our readers would pronounce to be the THREE GREAT POINTS *upon which, if the two Churches could come to a good understanding, the underbrush might easily be swept away.* The editor gave no opinion whether the positions as expressed were satisfactory or not; he only furnished the matter, which seemed to him unknown to the Church, for forming its own opinion. The facts, *whoever chose to conceal them*, or whoever unconsciously *overlooked them* as they lay in mass, he

thought ought to be revealed; otherwise our beloved Church might act unwisely because acting in the dark.

Whether the editor of the *Christian Advocate* consciously belonged to the class who overlooked, or the class who, for reasons he thought sufficient, concealed the truth, we presume not to say; but the disclosure seemed to disturb him as much as if he belonged to the latter, and as if the revelation was a rebuke upon his omission; or as if somebody were very presumptuous for revealing what he thought should be left unknown.

In his notice of that article, among many things to which we might object we note the following sentences upon this particular point; sentences which impeach the fair dealing of the editor of the Quarterly with his readers, and if the ideas conveyed were true would prove him unworthy of the place he occupied:

> The selections given from Southern Methodist papers are just those that, as there given, go to favor the views of the writer. They are each and all of them real extracts, and so far true; but they do not present a complete view of the whole case, for we could match them with equally extensive and quite as nervously expressed extracts from the same papers of a very different tone. Were the writer the professional *Advocate* of the Southern Church his method would be good, only a little too one-sided to be judicious; as it is, it is scarcely *judicial.*

If the first of the above sentences means that the views of the "writer" were in some degree consequent upon and adjusted to the positions taken in the selections, the statement is true, but lacks the slightest element of significance; if it means that the selections were culled by the "writer" from passages expressing different positions on those points equally entitled to be quoted, so as to suit antecedent opinions or purposes of his own, the statement is significant, but lacks the first element of truth.

The second of the above sentences is also so framed as to convey an idea which it does not unequivocally express. It does not aver that the editor of the *Advocate* can match the Quarterly selections with other "extracts" contradicting the *positions*, but with extracts in a different "*tone.*" Now however right the *positions*, the *tone* of some of those extracts was not the very best. But the editor of the *Advocate* may be safely challenged to produce a single extract from the Southern Methodist press up to the publication of that article contradicting the *positions* there quoted.*

* The editor of the (Richmond) *Episcopal Methodist* thus replies to the above extract from the *Advocate:*

"What purpose the editor of the *Review* has to subserve by the "selections" referred to, apart from truth and fairness, we are not capable of divining. We know, however, that he has uttered the truth, and have not delayed to acknowledge our obligations. Nor could any equally authentic and respectable evidence be produced *per contra* to invalidate the testimony advanced. We challenge its production as a contribution to truth."

And finally our extracts were neither "one-sided," nor attorney-like, nor judicial. They were not "one-sided," for they were *the only sided*, there being no other side. They were neither advocatory, nor judicial, but *evidential*. They were simply facts for the public judgment. Their only sin is this, that they show that the real *positions* of the Church South were such as the editor of the *Advocate* had omitted to state to the M. E. Church. And we may note that the suggestion of our being "the professional advocate of the South," and in that character more extreme than "judicious," (which is both *ad captandum* and *ad invidiam* in its obvious purpose,) is true only so far as that we believe that the truth ought to be known, even though it should be favorable to the Church South; and that it belongs to us as Christians, as Methodists, and as citizens, to so understand and deal with the South as to attain the greatest amount of peace and unity without compromise of principle.

---

*The New Orleans Advocate.* A Weekly Journal devoted to Christianity, our Country, and Literature. JOHN P. NEWMAN, D. D., Editor. Nos. 1–6, 1866.

The banner is at last unfurled. A free press is for the first time established in the very extreme point of ancient Cottondom, to proclaim the principles of Wesley's pure Arminianism and bold anti-slaveryism, of an unforced anti-secession loyalty to our nationality, and of the immutable rights of our universal humanity. Of these great principles Dr. Newman is, to a rare degree, an able, fearless, courteous champion, and we believe that the cause is safe and will be triumphant in his hands. The courtesy and conservative spirit of Dr. Newman entitle him to the confidence of the Southern people. He courts no hostilities; but, in the spirit of his mission of peace and mercy, he is ready not to antagonize but to co-operate with every existing agency for good. His paper is the signal of a revolution that, in spite of the dark omens at Washington, we trust will never go back. It is lifted up in the name of Him who will not cease until he hath sent judgment unto victory.

The paper is a small, neat affair, done up in excellent style, and we like everything about it but the name. Under the slavery regimen a "New Orleans Christian Advocate" has for years existed, and is now revived; and the name of this new paper trenches upon that with an interference and liability to confusion hardly obviated by the not very approvable omission of the word *Christian*. The name indicates a barrenness of invention, suggests an irksome

connection with a dead past, and subjects the editor to the preposterous yet effective charge of intending to secure the advantages of a counterfeit. Let us propose the fresher, more comprehensive, more religious and far more euphonious title, *The Louisiana Christian Advocate.*

The work of educating, elevating, and Christianizing the Southern colored population calls a new power, a new South, into efficient existence. With his eagerness for education, his aspiration for a position in the nation and in the world, and his habits of patient industry, the negro is starting on the high road even to a superiority to the effete old Southern mass, at least, of "mean whites," high or low. His intelligence will soon form a new body of readers and payers for periodicals. The new "Thomson Theological Seminary" and similar institutions will, in due time, give them an educated ministry. And the tawny South will, in time, assert by his own due qualifications and his own firm demands, aided by the moral voice of Christendom, his right to all the franchises of citizenship. We think it very idle for an abstract philanthropy to stand and cavil because this process is not performed upon an *à priori* theory. Whether there be separate schools and churches and seminaries for separate colors or not, is but a subsidiary question, not worth debating at the expense of working. Let the negro be trained by the rapidest route to his highest attainable quality, and we may leave the question of social and ecclesiastical equality to take care of itself in the future. We have no fears but that time will set those matters right.

We recommend Dr. Newman's paper to the patronage of the North; not merely in order to sustain it through its first experimental period—though that is an important reason—but because its columns give us the most vivid attainable picture of the particular South from which it hails. The sermons of ministers, white and colored, the editorials illuminating the moral battle-field over which they are issued, the journals of the ministers on their various routes, giving unique descriptions of southern sceneries and narratives of illustrative adventure, form a new phase of our denominational history, and render these columns to us the most interesting newspaper reading of the passing month. The New York "Preachers' Meeting" took the matter in hand to furnish a number of subscribers, and we trust that the kindred bodies in all our large towns will adopt similar measures. Thereby the noble editor will be cheered with assurances of success in his most important work.

## *Pamphlets.*

No. 1. *Resolutions of the General Conference on the Centenary of American Methodism.* Adopted at the Session of 1864.

No. 2. *Address of the Central Centenary Committee.*

No. 3. *Address of the Bishops to the Churches.*

No. 4. *Branch Committees.* Appointed by the Authority of the General Conference for the Celebration of the Centenary of American Methodism.

No. 5. *Address to Sunday-School Superintendents.* New York: Printed for the Committee, 200 Mulberry-street. 1866.

This pile of documents evinces that the stately Committee of bishops, elders, and laymen, with their indefatigable secretary, are a live body. They began their work in season, (near two years before the consummating month,) have constructed an abundant machinery, and have set it in full play, scattering documents, and inaugurating movements with liberal expense and inventive ingenuity; and we hope that, whatever drawbacks critical spectators may suggest, the results will entitle the Committee to the thanks of the Church.

That they have indeed overstepped the literal construction of their commission is, we think, unquestionable. What they were appointed for by the General Conference was "to determine to what objects and in what proportions the moneys *raised* as connectional funds shall be appropriated, and have power to take all steps to their distribution."

1. By these words, plainly, it is funds already "raised" upon which the Committee is to act. The "raised" is antecedent to the "determine." The donor, by the law, was at liberty, within the law, to fix his own object, by which of course the "*determination*" of the Committee would be regulated. But the Committee, before the "raised," lays down a programme which forestalls and controls the donor's choice.

2. The authority of this Committee is exclusively limited to the "moneys raised as connectional funds." But the Committee has proceeded to enact that "all the unspecified funds" shall be given to the "Connectional Educational Fund." Where is their authority for assuming control over "unspecified" funds? As the General Conference had left the application of "unspecified funds" untouched, the Annual Conferences alone possess any legislative authority over them, and are competent to apply them according to their own wisdom.

3. The Committee not only overrules the donors in regard to the objects they may select; but when a given object has received a certain amount of donation, all surplus, contrary to the will of the

donor, is to be taken and applied to some other object, an object to which the donor may be opposed. Thus it may become the interest of the donors that the amount given to a particular object shall be carefully limited.

4. The Committee have power to "determine" and superintend the distribution of the funds "raised," but have no commission to establish a system beforehand for the *raising* the funds. But what they *have done* is, with liberal draughts on the purse of the Church to construct a machinery and set it in active operation *for raising the funds.* This is beyond all doubt a large over-interpretation of their powers. Every movement made, every penny expended, every document printed, every agent salaried, for raising funds, is outside their commission. It involves movements for months and expenses of thousands of dollars. And it is equally clear that over-construing powers is a very dangerous procedure, and a very dangerous precedent. And yet, in this present case, we imagine that the Committee will be ultimately justified in "taking the responsibility." A previous programme, energetically prosecuted, was important to the success of the whole enterprise. We anticipate, therefore, that the Church will ultimately ratify, and the General Conference legitimate, the assumption. Still it irresistibly follows, so far, that *the Committee's programme is not mandatory but advisory.** There is

* The Central Centenary Committee, at their meeting held March 8, adopted the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas it appears from the proceedings of one of the conferences which has lately held its session, that the directions of the General Committee in relation to the appropriation of unspecified contributions have been set aside; and whereas it is made the duty of this committee to protect the connectional interests of the Centenary commemoration; therefore,

*Resolved*, 1. That we declare it to be the purpose of the Committee to insist upon its claim to the portion of the Centenary funds assigned to it by the authority of the General Committee, and to enforce its claim by all proper means.

2. That we request the Centenary Committees appointed by the annual conferences to revise the action taken wherein it violates the plan of the General Conference, and to make it conform thereto.

The Committee here is wrong and the Conference right. For, 1. No existing committee, general, central, or local, is vested with any authority over unspecified funds. There is here a blank spot in the General Conference legislation, which can truly be filled only by supplementary legislation, for which the Annual Conference alone has power. When either committee assumes to control the "unspecified funds," and the question comes, Where is your authority? it has no answer. Ask the Annual Conference that question, and it may reply: So long as I contravene no legislation of the General Conference, I have the same authority to legislate that it has. 2. The whole programme prescribing to what objects donors shall contribute is merely advisory. A careful recognition of this fact will save much hazardous friction. Nothing more endangers our whole movement than the dictatorial tone of utterances, coming mainly, we are glad to say, from one little Vatican.

no illegality in discussing or questioning their acts. Nor, were they exercising a power strictly expressed, would their exercise be above discussion. Neither political nor ecclesiastical powers, however absolute, are exempt from criticism. It is therefore as illegal, as it is in bad taste and against the spirit of the age, to enjoin silence, under charge of "disloyalty," in this particular case.* We do not, however, propose any full discussion of the wisdom of the programme with which we are furnished. We accept all its objects presented; not only because, since it is adopted, harmony is important to success, but because it is a much better programme than could have been attained without some organized furnishing. We have already approved, and do still most heartily approve, the predominance which has been given to the interests of education; interests which are at present behind every other interest of the Church. We have been building churches, and paying church debts, and sustaining missions through every year of our past history. It is about time to make one unanimous self-regenerating effort in behalf of that one as yet unsuccessful department of the Church's work, our colleges and theological institutes. And we believe that this effort will not only reinstaurate our educational institutions, but will create a new

* The following specimen of these "plantation manners" occurs in the "Methodist," of Feb. 24, 1866:

"Carlton & Porter have set themselves to overturn the well considered work of the Bishops and General Committee, and with it the work of all the Annual Conference Committees. They incur a fearful responsibility, and *will be held by the Church to a strict account for their conduct.*"

The following threats of legal prosecution, besides being unbased, exhibit an imperious style new to the Church:

It will be indispensable for the Annual Conferences to have an exact regard for the connectional part of the Centenary plan, or otherwise their proceedings may be liable to become null and void in law. . . . *The legal title to as much of the unspecified funds as is above described will be in the "Centenary Connectional Educational Board."* As faithful trustees, they will be *bound to see that whatever is due to their fund will be properly secured.—Methodist, March* 10 11

The following mandate to the bishops is issued in the "Methodist" of the 17th of March:

"The bishops, who appointed the General Committees, and were also members of it, have, in presiding over the Annual Conferences, a duty to perform which they can not, with a good conscience, neglect. It is their business to give notice to the Conferences where they are clearly violating the directions of the General Conference. The bishops aided in enacting the order in relation to unspecified contributions, and they are therefore doubly bound, as members of the General Committee and as bishops, to see that it is not infringed."

Whether any legal suasion is to be inflicted upon the bishops the mandate omits to state.

interest for the future in the hearts of our people in favor of that great department.

But there is one point of assumption on which our Committee is not so easily cleared, though we trust it may clear itself. It has exhibited a strong tendency to infringe upon the rights of the General Conference. It has proceeded to create a fund of untold millions, to be held by an independent and irresponsible board of trustees, legally incorporated, with powers of discretionary disbursement of a patronage of hundreds of thousands a year forever.* By the first plan, as adopted at Cleveland, the trustees were to be elected *solely* by the bishops in perpetuo. When numbers of persons were so "disloyal" as to protest against that extraordinary arrangement, it was so amended as that the bishops elect the first board and the General Conference have a half nomination to future vacancies; in all other respects it is to be a close corporation. In the meeting of the editors, this independence in the Board of Trustees over the General Conference was objected to, and the understanding was, that a clause prescribing that "it should be amenable to the General Conference" should be adopted; yet this clause, inefficient as it was, from its providing no method of enforcing that amenability, appears, so far as we can discover, in none of the documents published. All this, when in fact the General Conference has an incorporated board of trustees into whose hands this fund might and should have been provisionally placed. All this chariness of the control of the General Conference was perhaps unconscious, and it will appear so in precise proportion to the readiness to change when the clear view is taken of the full measure of the usurpation.

We do not wonder that mistakes of this kind should be incurred by the full Committee, when we consider that a complex system had to be formed, without precedent to guide, in a few brief hours, which would have occupied Congress as many weeks. We think, however, the Committee will, upon full review, feel it due to itself to refer so formidable a creation back to its own fountain of power. We doubt whether, otherwise, any General Conference will relish such an elephant upon its hands. But this incorporated board of trustees could, if it chose, shake its charter defiantly in the face of

* We had understood from a variety of sources that the application for incorporation would be postponed; but the following authoritative announcement from the ostensible spokesman for the Committee (Methodist, March 10) indicates the contrary: "This board will of course be incorporated, and will possess *full* LEGAL *powers* (sic) over the trust committed to its keeping."

It would be worth while to count how many *legal* allusions are contained in the various quotations we have had occasion to make.

the General Conference The creature would be too much for its creator. And overmastering the General Conference, it may overmaster the Church. We all know how the overwhelming wealth of Trinity Church has been able to overslaugh the Episcopal communion with a despotic High Churchism. Let this whole matter of a connectional fund be handed over to the General Conference trustees provisionally, and then let the fund be placed absolutely at the disposal of the wisdom of that body; whether to be boxed up and its interest doled out, or to be distributed to immediate use, thereby giving new life to our feeble educational institutions.

We acknowledge our preference for its immediate distribution by the General Conference. A fund is only by an accommodated meaning entitled to the name of *monument;* which properly belongs to a *visible, material* reminder of some great personage, fact, or truth; such in fact as a centenary building would be, like that proposed by Dr. Lore. And since we have failed of attaining a monument, the best possible application of the funds, yielding the most result, would be their *immediate reduction to* USE. We know how much richer we are than we were thirty years ago; and how foolish would it have been thirty years ago to have funded and used only the interest of our means! Just as unwise is it to lock up a large principal now, for thirty years hence, when our educational department hourly demands ALL we can furnish.

We say all this in full approval of the fund itself, wishing it to roll up into well-rounded millions; PROVIDED it be placed in the hands of the body whose real agent this Committee is, or at least should be. But WE LOYALLY STAND FOR THE RIGHTS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE. We can "trust posterity," but we cannot intrust posterity to the safe keeping of a close corporation. We can "trust the Church," but we cannot trust an independent, irresponsible millionary organization installed within the Church. We entertain the hope that the Committee will see that in honesty and in decency the whole matter should be referred back to its own creating power. We can all agree to "trust" the great representative body of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

When the empire of India with its boundless wealth became an appendage of Great Britain, the great genius of Charles James Fox, then prime minister of George III., was called into requisition to frame a plan for holding it in subjection. By Mr. Fox's famous "East India bill" seven trustees were to be appointed, and nominated by the prime minister, in whom was vested the manage-

ment of the golden realm. The nation was at once in alarm at the prospect of the inauguration of a moneyed oligarchy with the premier at its head. George III. threatened if the bill passed to abdicate his throne and return to Hanover. He promptly dismissed Mr. Fox and called in young William Pitt to the ministry, who dissolved the Parliament and appealed to the country for a new election. The country responded by the complete overthrow of Mr. Fox and his party. For nearly the entire remainder of his life Mr. Pitt retained the confidence and government of the nation, and Mr. Fox during that time struggled in a hopeless minority until Pitt's death left a vacancy he alone could fill.

---

*Manual of Information Respecting the American Methodist Ladies' Centenary Association.* 1866. "Our Golden Opportunity." 48mo., pp. 30. Chicago: Dunlop, Sewell, & Spalding. 1866.

It was, we believe, some months after the General Centenary Committee at Cleveland had fixed the programme by which the apportionment for all sections of the Church was fairly assigned, that Heck Hall was projected as an allowable after-thought, which should by a happy coincidence both honor "the foundress of American Methodism" and secure to Evanston an additional item of "our golden opportunity." By a neat special arrangement the authoritative programme of the Church was thus overlaid by another programme, claiming by "private interpretation" to be "connectional." Spontaneously, and without being recognized by the dull forms of law, the American Methodist Ladies' Association recognized itself as part and substance of the Centenary movement; and assuming, without any hesitation or imputable immodesty, a national name, overspread the whole Northern states, dividing the entire Church into branches. All this, we are further happy to add, was kindly and fraternally received by Eastern Methodism. It was editorially welcomed, its movements were favorably noticed, its documents spread out in our newspaper columns, and Heck Hall was for a while the principal centennial figure. No illegitimacy was imputed, no disloyalty for breaking in upon the settled programme of the General Committee, no presumption for assuming that a special building in rural little Evanston was a connectional object. And, finally, *here in New York* the association was at last legitimated, with a proviso admitting Concord into co-ordinate association. And then, inasmuch as New York made no additional claim, the Mission Rooms, which were her item in the Cleveland programme, were placed in co-ordination with Heck Hall and Concord, thus leaving a *debitum* in favor of cordially consenting New York.

We rejoice in and admire the spirit, however clever and rapid, that prompted this movement in our Northwest; and bid a hearty God-speed to Heck and Evanston. We trust that the Association even inaugurates a *new thought* rich in future results; a permanent institution, a lasting organization of the benevolent and enterprising ladies of our entire Church in the Church's great future work. Nor ought the ladies of this or any other section to grudge the historic honor due to the Northwest in originating and energetically putting the movement into complete existence. Classic Evanston has originated the idea, and has displayed the power to pervade the Church with such energetic ubiquity as renders her worthy to be the head-quarters of the possible permanent organization of the ladies of the Church.

But now for a varying view. When Dr. Lore proposed his grand conception—all honor to its noble-minded, noble-hearted author—of blending a Mission House, a Seminary, and a Book Concern into one noble monumental pile, on some sightly area in the city of New York, to stand conspicuous before the eye of the world as an honor to Methodism for ages, what a lively flare-up was aroused! It was pronounced a "vision," an illegitimacy, a breaking in upon the authoritative programme, a peril to the whole Centenary movement, "savoring of disloyalty." Shafts of keen point were played off upon the proposer for his noble utterance. And when our New York Agents seconded the magnificent proposal, they were treated with brilliant hits for uttering the absurdity that the ancient *Mother of all our Book Concerns* (save that the Chicago is her beautiful *grand*-daughter) should presume to be, like Heck Hall, a connectional interest! And to place a complete estopment upon the suggestion, it was intimated that if New York presented any such proposition, Cincinnati and Chicago would inaugurate counter demands, and claim each a "pile" as tall as New York's. They would do this, not because they were dissatisfied, or had any reason to be, with their present establishments. The idea is, *not that they want a new one*, but they *will* want a new one *if* New York is to have one. All which is not *quite* saying that they would fling in a counter claim as a block-wheel and a checkmate.

There was one argument, however, the Agents could not answer. They were slow—too late. The thing was already fastened with the stoutest and reddest of tape. It was true. Heck Hall was alert, young and nimble, anticipating the "golden opportunity" afar, and springing upon it with antelope agility. The old Mother had so long indulged the fogy habit of taking care of others that she had forgotten herself! But, then, the second meeting of the Com-

mittee tied things no tighter than the first, and the after-thought of the slow Mother was no more illegitimate than that of her sprightly great-great-grand-daughter which was afterward legitimated. And however slow, the Mother may yet prove sure. We would disturb no present platform. But we would still hope that the time may yet come when New York will find a way, in full accordance with authorized arrangements, to attain such a combination of enterprises as to harmonize results into one monumental block that may refer its honorary origin to our Centenary year.

And now to our Western brethren New York might make some fraternal suggestions. If Cincinnati or Chicago were not well conditioned in their book rooms the East is ready to aid in sustaining or renovating them, as she aided in planting them, as connectional interests. We had hitherto rejoiced in the thought that both Western Concerns were, as they stand, an honor to their cities and to Methodism. But ours, the Mother of all, is, in position, association, construction, and aspect, a discredit to the entire Eastern and Western Church. The street upon which she stands is obscure, filthy, and central amid disreputable surroundings. When a European Methodist visits America, the New York Concern first meets him with a tale of meanness and depreciation. When an American Methodist visits the Concern, he must be slightly imbued with the "connectional" spirit if he does not recognize that *he* is little honored by its metropolitan position or style. The dark and dingy old Mother, however, if she could speak, might utter some apology for her plight. She has been so occupied with founding Western, Southern, and Pacific Concerns that she is herself behind the age. She might ask, Is there to be no pre-eminence conceded to her primordial origin, or to her past noble history? Is there no veneration for the burdens she has borne and the service she has rendered? Pagan Carthage was the daughter of pagan Tyre, and the affection of the daughter for the mother was one of the prides of classic antiquity, and should be a lesson to our modern Christianity and our American Methodism.*

* Our patriarchal Christian Advocate, published in New York, lately flung off a clumsy and unmeaning addendum to her name, and became simply "The Christian Advocate." One would have supposed that this change, restoring the primitive simplicity of the name, would have called out from brother editors some pleasant reminiscences of veneration for the Mother of Advocates in thus becoming in name herself again. Her daughters might have referred generously to the time when she was ALONE; preparing the way for their existence. In this Centennial year, filial thought might have gone back to the days when the fathers, amid prayers and tears and trembling faith and self-sacrificing work *here* laid the feeble foundations of our common strength and glory. One would hardly have expected

One of the ablest treatises upon the success of Methodism which we ever read, furnished from an outside writer, specifies as pre-eminent among its causes our wise policy of placing our central machineries in the central places of power. London, and the other great towns, were the centers of Wesley's apparatus. New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore were the similar great fulcra in America. And now, in view of such a policy, is not New York out of sight of all competition, THE *great center* of American power? New York is the unquestioned metropolis of our nation, our continent, our hemisphere. Finish the Pacific Railroad, and she is the fairest candidate to be the commercial metropolis of our globe. She is directly in connection with and under the eye of Europe, spreading her radii over the ocean and over the earth. Place a magnificent monument to Methodism, proudly prominent in this metropolis, and it tells our story to Europe and America. Our standard is then nailed to the loftiest summit of the nation, and flares its folds in the eye of the whole world. When the European lands in our country, there is our strong Tower, telling him that Methodism is a national power in America. The whole Church would feel the elevating impulse. Not a Methodist in Cincinnati, in Chicago, or at any point of our nation's map, but that would experience its influence more powerfully than if placed upon his own street. Place such a monumental pile in Cincinnati, and what world-wide significance could it possess? No one certainly can see all this more clearly, or state it more forcibly, than our noble-minded editors in Cincinnati and Chicago. And yet, (indulge our frankness) in some strange moment of sectional narrowness, unlike themselves, they seem to speak as if just so far as New York is the seat of an ecumenical institution, just so far is the West dishonored and diminished. Now we in the East claim to be strong in the strength of our glorious West and North-west. Their strength and glory are our strength and glory, and our strength and glory are far more abundantly theirs. We become great, not by pulling each other down, but by building each other up. *We are* ONE! If placing any institution or structure, sole in its kind for the whole Church, shall most honor and benefit the Church if placed in Cincinnati, we lift our

that the change would be repeatedly flouted—with ingenious puns upon the names of editor, publishers, and street of publication—as being an immodesty, an arrogant and illegal assumption. We suppose the name of "The Wesleyan University" is as truly an immodesty. Dr. Upham, in his Mental Philosophy, says, that parental affection is a much stronger passion than filial. So thinks our dear old mother Concern.

hand, voice, and vote for Cincinnati. On the other hand, were our home now, as once it was, in the West, we would, we trust, be able to forget section and locality, and realize that a national ecumenical monumental pile should be placed in a national metropolitan position.

The entire sins of Dr. Lore's proposition are, 1. That *three institutions which are to exist should exist together in one noble monumental block;* 2. That the block should be allowed to honor our Centenary year; and 3. That those throughout the Church (or, perhaps, through the *eastern* section) who *wish* to contribute a mite to its erection, might have permission. Now, though the means and sources for the respective structures in the block should be other than Dr. Lore suggests, we still submit that this proposition honors the man who framed it, and would honor the Church, by its adoption, more CONSPICUOUSLY, though, no doubt, less beneficially, than all the rest of the centenary scheme. And so great the honor and benefit that, while it might justly distance all other supplementary propositions, it would, were harmony in the movement practicable, amply pay for a half dozen meetings of our noble Centenary Committee before next October to adopt it into the programme. At any rate the initiatory steps might be so taken by those who shall have in hand the selection of site and the ordering of material arrangements of the Mission Rooms, as that the "vision" may *in time* be realized into solid and harmonized result.

We fully agree that our liberal donors should be well "let alone" by officious advisers. Upon such public-spirited men we have never obtruded our opinions. But if New York herself were about to be the founder, and it were in order for us to contribute our little quota of counsel, we would modestly suggest that sixty miles of distance between an Institute and this City, would be—more than a drawback—a disaster! That Institute would be both *out of the way* and *in the way:* out of the way, because it is not in the right place; in the way, because it would for a long time forestall the establishment of one in New York city. For a college, the proper place is a rural town far from a great city; for a theological seminary, the true position is a Metropolis. For the young minister, and especially for the live young Methodist, the great city is not only an outside educator, furnishing models and means for improvement unknown to rural life; but it furnishes a great field for action blended with study, through which he is trained to the highest practical power, and by which the institution makes an impression upon the population. Place a great Methodist seminary here, and it will be not only such an honor to its founding as it can nowhere

else be, but it will be a power in the great metropolis, to be felt by the nation and the world. Place it on the same ground with our Mission Rooms and our Book Rooms and its impression will be world-wide. Let New York herself, for instance, place a seminary sixty miles distant and it would be a monumental mistake. A whole half century would suffer for the error, and 1966 would wonder at the unwisdom that committed it. Let New England place her theological seminary in Boston and it will be *the* commanding success. New York would show the grounds and buildings; New England would show the students, and Boston would take religious character from their perpetual presence and labors.

The foreign connections of New York render her the unquestioned position for our Mission Rooms. That for a theological seminary a metropolis is the proper place we hope to have shown. Now in unity with these place our Publishing house and Bookstore before the city's full view, fling off all unwise restriction limiting her sales, and this house could ride triumphantly the religious and literary book market of America, spreading a literature not only denominational, but pure and Christian even in its secular range, throughout the land. So doing she would beyond all past precedent honor and enrich the Church, and bless the country and the world. As it is we first hamper with restrictions, load down with burdens, fasten in a background locality, our venerable mother Concern, and then turn round and flout her for the little she accomplishes! Yet it is not a *little* she accomplishes. The systematic croakers in this as in most other cases are systematic liars. Up to a very late period she has carried the whole Episcopacy upon her back. She has triumphantly divided with the Church South. She has carried the Church through all her incidental expenses. She has given origin and aid to the most splendid system of periodical publications of any one existing purely voluntary Church. She is unsurpassed in her Sunday-school library. She has furnished a denominational literature mighty in power, never so influential over the public mind as now, never so increasing in power as now. But in order that she may take her place as a national literary power in the broad market, she needs a different position and prestige. Bring into one noble metropolitan block the three churchly buildings, and the whole have a value that separation will destroy. We prescribe no method, we would derange no existing plan; but were there the strong united *will* the matter demands, there would be the *way* to accomplish at least the initiation of this monumental work, and that in connection with this centenary. This, as we

trust, most *memorable* YEAR, *honored by God with glorious revivals*, signalized by the free offering of our unanimous hearts and hands, and auspicious with tokens of a hopeful future, would be fitly commemorated by such a structural emblem of UNITY.

---

Notices of the following works are postponed from want of room:

*Martin's History of France.* The Decline of the French Monarchy. By HENRI MARTIN. Translated from the fourth Paris edition. By MARY L. BOOTH. 2 vols. 8vo., pp. 546, 623. Boston: Walker, Fuller, & Co. 1866.

*Massachusetts Ecclesiastical.* By EDWARD BUCK, of the Suffolk Bar. 12mo., pp. 310. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard & Co. 1866.

*The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost;* Or, Reason and Revelation. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. 12mo., pp. 274. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

---

## *Miscellaneous.*

*The Shadow of Christianity;* Or, The Genesis of the Christian State, a Treatise for the Times. By the author of the Apocatastasis. 16mo., pp. 167. New York: Hurd & Houghton; Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co.

*A Manual of Devotion and Hymns for the House of Refuge*, City of New York. 18mo., pp. 289. New York: Published for the House of Refuge. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1865.

*Herman;* Or, Young Knighthood. By E. FOXTON. 2 vols. 12mo., pp. 416, 391. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1866.

*Notes from Plymouth Pulpit.* A Collection of Memorable Passages from the Discourses of Henry Ward Beecher. With a Sketch of Mr. Beecher and the Lecture Room. By AUGUSTA MOORE. A new edition and greatly enlarged. 12mo., pp. 374. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*Reminiscences, Historical and Biographical, of Sixty-four Years in the Ministry.* By Rev. HENRY BOEHM, Bishop Asbury's Traveling Companion and Executor of his last Will and Testament. Edited by Rev. JOSEPH B. WAKELEY. 12mo., pp. 493. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

*The Elements of Moral Science.* By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D.D., LL.D., late President of Brown University and Professor of Moral Philosophy. Revised and improved edition. 12mo., pp. 396. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard & Co.

*Plain Talks on Familiar Subjects:* A Series of Popular Lectures by J. G. HOLLAND. 12mo., pp. 335. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

*The Living Forces of the Universe.* By GEORGE W. THOMPSON. 12mo., pp. 358. Philadelphia: Howard Challen; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Boston: Lee & Shepard; London: Trubner & Co. 1866.

*An Introduction to the Devotional Study of the Holy Scriptures.* By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D. First American from seventh London edition. 16mo., pp. 193. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

*Manual of Biblical Interpretation.* By JOSEPH MUENSCHER, D.D. 16mo., pp. 318. Gambier, O: Printed for the Author. 1865.

*Stories Told to a Child.* By JEAN INGELOW. 24mo., pp. 424. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866.

THE

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1866.

## ART. I.—THE SECOND GENERAL CONFERENCE: WHEN WAS IT HELD AND WHAT DID IT DO?

*Short History of the Methodists*, etc. By JESSE LEE. 1810.
*Asbury's Journals.* 3 vols. 1852.
*General Conference Journals*, etc. Edited by Rev. Dr. M'CLINTOCK. 3 vols. 1855.
*Articles in the Christian Advocate*, etc., January and February, 1859. By Rev. F. S. DE HASS and Rev. Dr. COGGESHALL.

THE importance which Methodism has attained in America by, at least, its numerical growth, has rendered everything related to its early history interesting to the present generation of its people. Something like a bibliomania for its primitive documents has prevailed among us for the last twenty years, and new books, biographies, "reminiscences," "memorials," historical essays, relics, have multiplied so greatly, that perhaps no leading denomination in the republic has now more abundant materials for the illustration of its early annals. There may be a providential significance in this fact, for the history of the development of a Church or a State must, above all things, include its infancy; and such a genetic history, rightly prepared, so as to exhibit the intimate or interior life of the body, must be among the most effective means of conserving its original spirit and directing its prospective mission—the type and model of its

destiny. What a hiatus would there be in the records of the original Church had not Luke written the "Acts of the Apostles!" And what an advantage to the ecclesiastical world would be the discovery of a manuscript history of the immediate post-apostolic Church, written by Polycarp or Irenæus! How much more precious would it be than the Constantinian production of Eusebius!

It cannot be denied that our early Church documents have needed thorough revision. The "fathers" were too intent on work to care much about their records; and, perhaps, they never anticipated the historical importance which time was to give to almost every trace of those records. The early Minutes abound in inaccuracies, not only of orthography in names, but of figures in their returns of members. The date of the first New England Conference, as given by them, is incorrect: and Lee, who was in New England at the time, reproduces the error in his history, though we have conclusive evidence that the session did not occur at the time appointed, but a year later; that the honor belongs to Massachusetts, not to "Connecticut;" and that Lee, in cutting the list of conferences from the old Minutes, inadvertently transferred it without correction to his pages. Most of our books have given the honor of the first ultramontane conference to Uniontown, Pennsylvania; but it is now decisively proved (from Asbury himself) that it was held among the heights of the Holston country, and the distinction belongs to that region, where the Church has again organized its first conference, beyond "Mason and Dixon's Line," after the restoration of the Union. Following the Minutes, it was long supposed that Losee, the first regular Methodist preacher to Canada, entered that great field in 1791; and should the Canadian Church propose to celebrate the Centenary of that memorable event, it would, were it to follow the Minutes and our sanctioned histories, make an unfortunate blunder, for it is conclusively ascertained that Losee entered Canada in 1790. Of the very first American Conference we have three dates; and a casual passage from Rankin, in the old Arminian Magazine, has alone, and in our day, determined the question. The more important General Conference of 1784, the most important in our history, as the session at which the "Methodist Episcopal Church" was organized, is reported officially, in

its "Minutes" or "Discipline," to have been held "on Monday the 27th of December;" whereas we all know that it was begun on the 24th of December, 1784, and ended on the 2d of January, 1785. And our standard historian, for years, gave, as the Discipline adopted on this great occasion, a copy of a later Discipline, modified and recast in its entire form, and also gave (from Lee's report) the important enactments on slavery (the most extended and most honorable ever enacted by the Church down to 1864) as the supposed "*substance* of what this conference did in reference to this subject," "though," he says, he "could not find them in the printed Minutes or in the Discipline," from which he quotes the other doings of the session; whereas it is indisputable that these glorious prohibitions were not the mere "substance," but the exact statutes of the first General Conference, and were actually printed in the "Minutes" or "Discipline" a few months after its session, but were suspended and expunged before the edition from which the historian quotes. Such are but examples of the perplexities that beset the student of our early records.

There is another example which has occasioned no small controversy in our papers, and which has hitherto remained undecided, though it involves no less a question than that with which we head this article.

We have, by order of the General Conference of 1852, a well edited collection of the Journals of that body from the session of 1796; but we all know that there was a session in 1792, and that the great Christmas Conference of 1784 was also a general session. No Journal, however, of either of these sessions remains among the manuscripts of the General Conference archives, and the editor of the ordered work did not feel at liberty to insert in it unofficial accounts of their proceedings. But was the session of 1792 the first held after the Christmas Conference of 1784? Was not the Conference of 1787 (held in Baltimore) a General Conference, and the next held there, in 1788, an adjourned session of the same body? Such is the question which many of our readers will recall, as stoutly debated in the Christian Advocate, New York, in January and February, 1859, by Rev. Mr. De Hass and Rev. Dr. Coggeshall, respectively affirmative and negative in the dispute. The debate was without a satisfactory

issue.* It is singular how plausible the argument for the affirmative appears, and yet how decisive that of the negative really is. We can give here but a summary of the evidence, *pro* and *con*, not confining ourselves, however, to the two able disputants named, but presenting additional data on both sides.

1. An important fact in favor of 1787 (but not cited we believe, though alluded to, by either disputant) is a letter of Wesley requesting Coke to hold a General Conference at that time. The letter is dated September 6th, 1786, and says, "I desire that you would appoint a General Conference of all our preachers in the United States, to meet at Baltimore on May 1st, 1787, and that Mr. Richard Whatcoat may be appointed superintendent with Mr. Francis Asbury." (See Lee's Life, etc., of Jesse Lee, p. 196, Note.) This is certainly a plausible initiative for the affirmative. Moreover,

2. Coke did, by correspondence, (from the West Indies, we suppose,) invite the preachers to such a meeting.

3. The session of the Baltimore Conference, which had in 1786 been appointed for Abingdon, Maryland, on the 24th of July, 1787, was actually changed, and the body did, in fact, meet in Baltimore on the 1st of May, the day proposed by Wesley. (Lee's History, p. 124.)

4. There was much important business done at this session which properly belongs to a General Conference, according to all our modern ideas of the relations of General and Annual Conferences. Mr. De Hass presents this argument strongly. He says:

> A glance at the proceedings of this conference will convince any one that it was something more than a mere district gathering. It was at this conference the Discipline was first arranged under proper heads, divisions, and sections. They introduced several new rules and regulations, binding on the whole Church, changed the title of superintendent to bishop, created the office of recording steward, fixed the allowance of traveling preachers with families.

* Even our senior bishop supposed, in 1858, that there was a General Conference between the sessions of 1784 and 1792. He says: "If any regular sessions were held in 1788 and 1792 the Minutes were not printed—probably not recorded—and are lost. It is presumable, however, that they were held, and that they were held in the autumn." (*Christian Advocate*, Dec. 22, 1858.) There can be no question about the session of 1792, and I shall presently give its doings; but the question is about 1788, or rather 1787-8.

provided to have the marriages and baptisms properly registered, with other regulations in regard to the instruction and admission of children and colored persons into the Societies. Most of these questions had never been submitted to the district conferences, and were here acted on decisively, and at once became the law of the Church. It was also at this conference that Dr. Coke was arraigned and censured for his abuse of episcopal authority, and that Mr. Wesley's name was dropped from the Minutes after being placed there by the General Conference of 1784, and after that body had solemnly declared that during his lifetime they would "obey his commands in matters belonging to the Church." They also elected Freeborn Garrettson superintendent of the work in Nova Scotia and the West Indies, and would have ordained him had he not objected; and they discussed the question of electing and ordaining Richard Whatcoat to the office of bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church, with other grave questions of this character, which certainly would appear ridiculous in a small district conference composed of a dozen members.*

Mr. De Hass adds similar evidence to show that the session of 1788 was an adjourned meeting of the supposed General Conference of 1787.

These are certainly strong proofs; they would seem almost, if not quite, conclusive of the question, and they show how liable we are, in the obscurity or ambiguity of our Church documents, to fall into mistakes respecting some of our most important ecclesiastical events. But let us look at the other side of the question.

1. Taking together the first three of these arguments, it may be replied that the facts of Wesley's requesting a General Conference, and of Coke's correspondence calling it, and changing the date of the Baltimore Annual Conference for the purpose, are undenied and undeniable. But it must be further replied, that though Coke did these things, presuming on the authority of his episcopal office, and by the sanction of Wesley, yet Asbury and the preachers generally dissented from his proceedings. Coke, on reaching the country in March, 1787, to attend the Conference, says that he was "very coolly"† received by Asbury; and when they arrived at the Conference he was rebuked severely by the preachers for his change of the time

* Mr. De Hass gives further examples; we omit them, however, because the above will suffice, and because the remainder are historically inaccurate, and we cannot now spare space to show their inaccuracy.

† Coke's "Journals." London, 1793.

of the session, his correspondence, etc. He had to give, over his sign manual, a pledge to do so no more; and Wesley's name was omitted from the Minutes, and the old recognition of his authority in the American Church was erased. Evidently the preachers dissented from Wesley's wish and Coke's measures.

2. The session of 1787 did not do the business for which Wesley had proposed a General Conference. Richard Whatcoat was not elected a bishop, nor was Freeborn Garrettson, though Wesley requested both appointments. Bangs* says that the suggestion of the latter by Wesley was "unanimously sanctioned" by his brethren, but he shows that there was no election. Lee's account of Garrettson's case is quite inaccurate, (according to Garrettson's own statements;) but Lee himself shows that there was no election nor ballot on either case.†

3. That many of the measures of the sessions of 1787-88 were of a general character, appropriate only to the general action of the ministry, cannot be denied, but this fact can be readily explained. The first General Conference (of 1784) assembled for the organization of the Church, and having accomplished its business, adjourned without providing for any subsequent session. General as well as local business went on as before. Measures of a general character were submitted to the successive Annual Conferences, and, at the final session of the year, were considered to be determined by the majority of votes in all; the Minutes of all appeared still, in print, as the records of but one conference; and their enactments were from time to time inserted in the Discipline without reference to where or how they were enacted. Now it so happened that the Baltimore session for 1787 was the last session for that year,‡ and therefore its reported doings were given as the results of all the sessions of the year; that is to say, not of a General Conference, but of the Conferences generally. We are also of the opinion, from scattered allusions in contemporary books, that not a few important measures, applying to the whole Church, were decided sometimes by one or two of the principal conferences, (like that of Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New York,) without reference to the remoter sessions. In fact the Church was yet in its forming process, and like an

* Life of Garrettson. † History of the Methodists, p. 126. ‡ Ibid., p. 124.

army on the march or in the field, was not very fastidious about questions of law. If the Baltimore sessions of 1787 and 1788 should be considered General Conferences, because of their important or general enactments, so then should that of Charleston, South Carolina, of 1789 (then on the southern frontier of the Church) for its doings about the Book Concern, "the College," the famous "Council," Sunday Schools, etc.,* and also that of 1785, which suspended the antislavery law of the Church.

4. Jesse Lee, the contemporary historian of the denomination, was at the sessions of 1787 and 1788, and was stationed in Baltimore in the interval of these sessions, and yet he nowhere speaks of them as General Conferences, but numbers them and reports them among the other annual sessions. This was an unpardonable oversight in the first historian of the Church if they were General, not Annual Conferences.

5. But Lee, on the other hand, distinctly names the session of 1792 as "*the first regular General Conference.*" If it be replied that he meant by the "first *regular*" session only that it was the first of the series which, from 1792, met *regularly* every four years, but that the session in question was an *irregular* one, the rejoinder might properly be that there was no reason for any such discrimination, for the session in question (especially as adjourned to 1788) was held at the same distance of time before 1792 as the session of 1796 was after it.

6. "Straws show which way the wind blows," says the familiar maxim; and sometimes, when the air is too still for any more conspicuous indicator to show its course, a feather, by its very lightness, can decide the question. There is a brief clause in Asbury's Journals which we think has a similar significance in the present case. We have seen that when Coke arrived in Charleston, South Carolina, from the West Indies, on his way to the supposed General Conference at Baltimore, he was "very coolly" received by Asbury. Now it so happened that when James O'Kelly withdrew from the Church, five years later, he published a pamphlet against Asbury, accusing him of all sorts of maladministration, etc., and among other charges says that he treated Coke at his arrival with excessive "sharpness." About fourteen years after the alleged

* See Asbury's Journals, ii, 65

General Conference, Asbury, in noticing this pamphlet, says, "There was no sharpness at all upon my side with Dr. Coke, at Charleston, respecting the *proposed* General Conference, (*which was afterward held* in 1792.) I was fully convinced that nothing *else* would finish the unhappy business with O'Kelly, and that did finish it." *

Evidently, then, Coke's "proposed General Conference" was not held in 1787 or 1788, but "afterward, in 1792."

The session of 1792 was therefore not only "the first regular," but also the second General Conference; there having been none before it since the first or Christmas session of 1784. If this question is thus concluded, we are prepared to ascertain, as far as possible, the doings and results of the session of 1792, for, as already intimated, not only has its place in the series of General Conferences been hitherto undetermined, but its proceedings have no place in the standard publication of the Journals of the General Conferences, nor indeed in any of our official records.

The difficulties between Coke and his American brethren, occasioned by the events of 1787, had subsided, and he left England, in 1792, to greet them in their first regular General Conference with no little eagerness, but was detained sixty days on the sea, and despaired of reaching the country in time for the session. On the 28th of October he writes, "A pilot is just come on board, and in all probability I shall be in Baltimore in time! The Lord does all things well; glory and honor be ascribed to him forever!" Two days later he landed at Newcastle, Delaware. He had "seventy miles to ride in the space of a day and a few hours, in order to be in time" for the session; he flew over the distance, wearing out one chaise-horse and breaking down another. "About nine o'clock Wednesday night, October 31st, I arrived," he says, "at the house of my friend, Philip Rogers, of Baltimore; just in time enough to take some refreshment and a little sleep before the General Conference commenced. Mr. Asbury and the preachers who were at Mr. Rogers's were surprised to see me at that critical moment. They had almost given me up, but intended to spend

* Journals, iii, 8. The italics are our own, except with the word "*else*."

ten days in debating matters of the smallest importance, in prayer, and in declaring their experiences before they entered on the weightier business, if I did not sooner arrive." Asbury and his brethren had not heard of his return; with thankful surprise, as we have seen, they "embraced him in great love."

The General Conference began on the 1st of November, 1792. Lee, who was present, sketches, only in outline, its most important measures. He represents the gathering of preachers as numerous "from all parts of the United States where we had any circuits formed." They came with "the expectation that something of great importance would take place in the connection" in consequence of the session; they supposed that "in all probability there would never be another conference of that kind;" but that, owing to the rapid extension of the ecclesiastical field, it would adopt some permanent regulations "which would prevent the preachers from coming together in a General Conference." If they anticipated any regular quadrennial session, it is probable that they supposed it would be a delegated body, for Lee himself had advocated this modification, and is entitled to the credit of being the author of the change,* which, though resisted for sixteen years, was at last forced upon the body in 1808 by irresistible necessity.

A "Council" had been devised by Asbury for the transaction of the general business of the Church, a sort of oligarchical General Conference. It had proved itself a failure; yet at its last session, in 1790, it had adjourned to meet in Baltimore, or at Cokesbury College, in December 1792, probably supposing that it would be recognized and empowered by the General Conference. But Lee, who had stoutly opposed it from the beginning, reports that "the bishops and preachers in general showed a disposition to drop it, and all things belonging thereto." Asbury even requested that its name might not again be mentioned in the conference, "and no one attempted to bring forward that business afterward." It was tacitly abolished; "it was dead," says Lee's biographer, "and Mr. Lee was present at its burial." It had threatened to disown him as a preacher because of his opposition to it; but

* Dr. Lee's Life of Lee, p. 270. Asbury also gives him credit for it somewhere in his Journals.

"his triumph had come, and it was complete. He enjoyed it in silence."

On the first day rules for the government of the body were enacted. A committee was appointed to prepare and report to it all its business. As, however, the debates in the committee had to be reported in the full assembly, it was found not to expedite but rather retard business. It was enlarged, but at last dismissed. The chief restrictive regulation that was adopted provided that two thirds of all the members voting could abolish an old law or make a new one, but that a majority might alter or amend any existing law.

The first day was spent in considering the rules of the house. On the second * O'Kelly introduced a motion affecting radically the form of the episcopate, and indirectly reflecting on the administration of Asbury. It absorbed all attention for nearly a week, so that the revision of the Discipline, and the most needed legislation of the session, did not begin till Tuesday the 6th. The excited debates were relieved by extraordinary religious services on Sunday, when Coke preached "a delightful sermon" on Romans viii, 16, the Witness of the Spirit, which was printed by order of the conference. O'Kelly, who was one of the most commanding men of the itinerancy, preached in the afternoon on Luke xvii, 5: "The apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith." "The power of the Lord attended the word," says a hearer. † At night Henry Willis, the best beloved, by Asbury, of all the itinerants of that day, preached on Psalm xcv, 10, 11, probably with reference to the strifes of the period against the bishop, for Willis defended him and opposed O'Kelly in the conference debates. Meanwhile there was daily preaching in the city and vicinity, and a general "revival" was kindled, for there were many of the preachers who cared more for the prosperity of the Churches than for the controversies of the conference.

On Tuesday of the second week began the revision of the Discipline. Regular General Conferences were ordained, and the Annual Conferences were distinguished from these quadrennial assemblies by the title of "District Confer-

* For the order of the proceedings during about half the session, I am indebted to an account by William Colbert, a member, given in Peck's "Early Methodism," etc., p. 39.

† Ibid.

ences," as it was determined to hold one of the latter for each presiding elder's district,* their limits to be defined by the bishops, "yet so as not to include more than twelve, nor less than three circuits in each district." The bishops had also power to appoint the times of their sessions. The character of a "supernumerary preacher" was for the first time stated; he is "one who is so worn out in the itinerant service as to be rendered incapable of preaching constantly, but is willing to do any work in the ministry which the conference may direct and his strength enable him to perform." Provision was made for the election, ordination, and trial of bishops. The office of Presiding Elder took, for the first time, a definitive form, and the title appears for the first time in the Discipline.† The Order of Elders was provided in the organization of the Church of 1784; as Wesley, however, had requested that as few candidates as were absolutely necessary for the administration of the sacraments should be appointed, only twelve were then ordained.‡ With Wesley's approval the number was afterward increased. They traveled over given sections of the Church, administering the sacraments and maintaining a general supervision of the circuits. Their appointment to their respective sections had hitherto been without limitation in respect to time. James O'Kelly, for example, had traveled the same district in southern Virginia ever since his ordination in 1784, and had been stationed there several years before. It is supposed that disadvantages, resulting from his case, led to the present modifications of the office. The new law provided that the bishops should appoint the presiding elders to their districts, not allowing them a longer term than four years on any one district; that it should be the duty of the elder to travel through his appointed district; in the absence of a bishop, to take charge of all the elders, deacons, traveling and local preachers, and exhorters in his district; to change, receive, or suspend preachers during the intervals of the conferences, and

* The Annual Conferences are thus called throughout the Discipline of 1792, but never afterward. From 1820 to 1836 the title reappears in the Discipline as the name of certain Local Preachers' Conferences. (Emory's History of Discipline, p. 110.)

† The title does not appear in the Annual Minutes, however, till 1797, though it had been used in 1789 in the scheme of the "Council" and in the Minutes.

‡ The Bishops' Notes to the Discipline of 1796.

in the absence of the bishop; in the absence of a bishop to preside in the conference of his district; to be present, as far as practicable, at all its quarterly meetings; and to call together, at each quarterly meeting, all the traveling and local preachers, exhorters, stewards, and leaders of the circuit, to hear complaints, and to receive appeals; to oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the societies; to take care that every part of the Discipline be enforced; to attend the bishop when present in his district, and to give him when absent all necessary information, by letter, of the state of his district. He was to be supported by any surplus of the contributions for the ministry on the circuits of his charge, and if there should be no surplus, he was to share equally with his corps of preachers.

The office as thus developed has been of momentous importance in the progress of the Church. If the episcopate has been the right arm, the presiding eldership has been the left arm of its disciplinary administration, a virtual though subordinate episcopacy, without the right to ordain. By the present conference the presiding elder was virtually made a diocesan bishop; he had charge of a whole conference, for each district was a conference. The services of the office in the early history of the denomination, and its later importance in the new fields of the ministry, can hardly be exaggerated. Preachers' wives had been allowed pecuniary assistance from the Church; they were now made claimants upon its funds to an amount equal to that of their husbands', sixty-four dollars per annum. Besides the preacher's salary or allowance, his "traveling expense" were to be paid by the circuit; these, in the language of the contemporary historian, were for "ferriage, horse-shoeing, and provisions for himself and horse on the road when he necessarily rode a distance." The interdiction of fees for marriages was taken off; the preacher was now permitted to receive but "not to charge" them. Should there, however, be a deficiency in the circuit contributions for the ministry, all such gifts were to be placed in the hands of the stewards, and be equally divided among the circuit preachers. They were required also, in order to receive any aid from the conference funds, to report "all moneys, clothes, and other presents of any kind," a rule characteristic not only of the simplicity of the times but also of the

intimate brotherhood of the ministry; "intended," says the historian, "to keep all the preachers as nearly on an equal footing as possible in their money matters, that there might be no jealousies or envyings among us; but that we, like brethren of the same family, might all labor together in the Gospel of Jesus Christ." They were not allowed to "receive a present" for baptism or the burial of the dead. A rule was adopted for the settlement of disputes between brethren "concerning the payment of debts;" it underwent various modifications, from time to time, till 1812, when it received the form it still bears in the Discipline. The form of public worship was prescribed, without an allusion to Wesley's abridged liturgy; and the use of fugue tunes was disapproved. Methodists removing from one Church to another were required to bear with them a certificate stating that "A. B., the bearer, has been an acceptable member in C.," still an indispensable requirement throughout the Church. Provision was made for the trial of preachers for immorality, or improper conduct, and also for heresy. "The latter," says Lee, "was to prevent the spreading of the erroneous doctrines which had been imbibed and propagated in public and in private by Mr. J. O'Kelly, who, previous to that time, had taken much pains to draw off some of our preachers into his way of thinking, and had so far succeeded in his endeavors as to get some of the preachers confused and bewildered in their minds about the doctrine of the Trinity. At this conference we made the following rule, in addition to the former one, respecting the trial of private members: 'If a member of our Church shall be clearly convicted of endeavoring to sow dissensions in any of our Societies, by inveighing against either our doctrine or discipline, such person so offending shall be first reproved by the senior preacher of his circuit; and if he afterward persist in such pernicious practices he shall be expelled the Society.'"

Such were the principal amendments of the Discipline made at this session of the General Conference. In their preface to the next edition the bishops say:

We have made some little alterations in the present edition, yet such as affect not in any degree the essentials of our doctrines and discipline. We think ourselves obliged frequently to view and review the whole order of our Church, always aiming at perfection,

standing on the shoulders of those who have lived before us, and taking the advantage of our former selves.*

But the chief subject of its deliberations was the proposition of James O'Kelly to so abridge the episcopal prerogative that "after the bishop appoints the preachers, at conference, to their several circuits, if any one thinks himself injured by the appointment he shall have liberty to appeal to the conference and state his objections; and if the conference approve his objections, the bishop shall appoint him to another circuit." O'Kelly doubtless had prepared the way, among the preachers, for the agitation of this radical innovation, and Asbury evidently anticipated it; for he writes, "I felt awful at the General Conference."† The motion was obviously a reflection on his administration, but he bore it with admirable magnanimity. He adds:

At my desire they appointed a moderator, and preparatory committee, to keep order and bring forward the business with regularity. We had heavy debates on the first, second, and third sections of our form of discipline. My power to station the preachers without an appeal was much debated, but finally carried by a very large majority. Perhaps a new bishop, new conference, and new laws would have better pleased some. I have been much grieved for others, and distressed with the burden I bear, and must hereafter bear. O my soul, enter into rest! Ah, who am I, that the burden of the work should lie on my heart, hands, and head?

Having secured the organization of the body, with Coke for moderator, he retired anxious and sick, but his "soul breathing unto God, and exceedingly happy in his love." He addressed the following characteristic letter to the Conference:

Let my absence give you no pain; Dr. Coke presides. I am happily excused from assisting to make laws by which myself am to be governed: I have only to obey and execute. I am happy in the consideration that I never stationed a preacher through enmity, or as a punishment. I have acted for the glory of God, the good of the people, and to promote the usefulness of the preachers. Are you sure that if you please yourselves the people will be as fully satisfied? They often say, "Let us have such a preacher;"

* In 1792, the Discipline of the Church was revised and somewhat altered. The sections were distributed into three chapters, of which the first, containing twenty-six sections, related to the ministry; the second, containing eight sections, to the membership; and the third, containing ten sections, embraced the temporal economy of the Church, the Doctrinal Tracts, and the Forms.

† Asbury's Journals, 1792.

and sometimes "We will not have such a preacher, we will sooner pay him to stay at home." Perhaps I must say, "His appeal forced him upon you." I am one, ye are many. I am as willing to serve you as ever. I want not to sit in any man's way. I scorn to solicit votes. I am a very trembling, poor creature to hear praise or dispraise. Speak your minds freely; but remember, you are only making laws for the present time. It may be that, as in some other things, so in this, a future day may give you further light.

"I am not fond of altercations," he writes in his journal; "we cannot please everybody, and sometimes not ourselves. I am resigned."

The discussion, as we have seen, occupied nearly a week; it was the first of those great parliamentary debates which have given pre-eminence to the deliberative talent of the body. It was led chiefly by O'Kelly, Ivey, Hull, Garrettson, and Swift for the affirmative, and by Willis, Lee, Morrell, Everett, and Reed for the negative, all chieftains of the itinerancy and eloquent preachers.* The mere intimations respecting it, found in the writings of contemporary Methodists, show that it was an occasion of extraordinary interest. Lee says "the arguments, for and against, were weighty, and handled in a masterly manner. There never had been a subject before us that so fully called forth all the strength of the preachers." Coke, however anxious for the issue of the controversy, sat in the chair rapt in admiration of the talent it elicited. Lee records a brief outline of the proceedings. He says:

A large majority appeared at first to be in favor of the motion. But at last John Dickins moved to divide the question thus: 1. Shall the bishop appoint the preachers to the circuits? 2. Shall a preacher be allowed an appeal? After some debate the dividing of the question was carried. The first question being put, it was carried without a dissenting voice. But when we came to the second question, "Shall a preacher be allowed an appeal?" there was a difficulty started, whether this was to be considered a new rule, or only an amendment of an old one. If it was a new rule, it would take two thirds of the votes to carry it. After a considerable debate it was agreed by vote that it was only an amendment of an old rule. Of course after all those lengthy debates we were just where we began, and had to take up the question as it was proposed at first. One rule for our debates was, "That each person if he choose shall have liberty to speak three times on each motion." By dividing the question, and then

* Peck's Early Methodism, p. 39.

coming back to where we were at first, we were kept on that subject, called the *Appeal*, for two or three days. On Monday we began the debate afresh, and continued it through the day; and at night we went to Mr. Otterbein's church, and again continued it till near bedtime, when the vote was taken, and the motion was lost by a large majority.

The good and thoughtful Thomas Ware was a member of the conference, and has left us a further glimpse of the great discussion. He says:

It was allowed on all hands that no sacrifice could be too great to accomplish the object we had in view, namely, the salvation of souls: but the question was, whether the means were the most perfectly adapted to the accomplishment of that object; whether for this purpose so large a body of men should hold themselves ready to go wherever the general superintendent should deem it best in his judgment to send them. The number of traveling preachers was at this time two hundred and sixty-six. Had Mr. O'Kelly's proposition been differently managed it might possibly have been carried. For myself, at first I did not see anything very objectionable in it. But when it came to be debated, I very much disliked the spirit of those who advocated it, and wondered at the severity in which the movers and others who spoke in favor of it indulged in the course of their remarks. Some of them said that it was a shame for a man to *accept* of such a lordship, much more to *claim* it; and that they who would submit to this absolute dominion must forfeit all claims to freedom, and ought to have their ears bored through with an awl, and to be fastened to their master's door and become slaves for life. One said that to be denied such an appeal was an insult to his understanding, and a species of tyranny to which others might submit if they chose, but for his part he must be excused for saying he could not. The advocates of the opposite side were more dispassionate and argumentative. They urged that Mr. Wesley, the father of the Methodist family, had devised the plan, and deemed it essential for the preservation of the itinerancy. They said that, according to the showing of Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Wesley, if he were alive, ought to blush, for he claimed the right to station the preachers to the day of his death. The appeal, it was argued, was rendered impracticable on account of the many serious difficulties with which it was encumbered. Should one preacher appeal, and the conference say his appointment should be altered, the bishop must remove some other one to make him room; in which case the other might complain and appeal in his turn; and then again the first might appeal from the new appointment, or others whose appointments these successive alterations might interrupt. Hearing all that was said on both sides, I was finally convinced that the motion for such an appeal ought not to carry.

The next morning, after the decision of the question, the conference was startled by a letter from O'Kelly and "a few other preachers," declaring that they could no longer retain their seats in the body, "because the appeal was not allowed." A committee of preachers was immediately appointed to wait upon them and persuade them to resume their seats. Garrettson, who had taken sides with them in the controversy, was on this committee. He says:

> Mr. O'Kelly's distress was so great on account of the late decision that he informed us by letter that he no longer considered himself one of us. This gave great grief to the whole conference. Two persons were appointed with me as a committee to treat with him. Many tears were shed, but we were not able to reconcile him to the decision of the conference. His wound was deep, and apparently incurable.

Before the week closed O'Kelly had an interview with Coke, but availed himself of it to criminate the doctor and the conference. Finally, says Lee in his naive style:

> He and the preachers that were particularly influenced by him set off for Virginia, taking their saddle-bags, great coats, and other bundles on their shoulders or arms, walking on foot to the place where they left their horses, which was about twelve miles from town. I stood and looked after them as they went off, and observed to one of the preachers that I was sorry to see the old man go off in that way, for I was persuaded he would not be quiet long, but would try to be head of some party. The preacher then informed me that Mr. O'Kelly denied the doctrine of the Trinity, and preached against it, by saying that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were characters, and not persons; and that these characters all belonged to Jesus Christ. That Jesus Christ was the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The preacher further said, that it was his intention to have had O'Kelly tried at that conference for the false doctrines which he had been preaching; and he believed that his leaving the conference was more out of fear of being brought to trial than on account of the appeal. But so it was, Mr. James O'Kelly never more united with the Methodists.

Asbury had triumphed by his wise silence; his supporters in the debate had prevailed not so much by the abstract merits of their side of the question, as by the practical good sense, and loyalty to the Church, with which they drew their arguments from its peculiar circumstances and necessities. Abstractly considered, O'Kelly's proposition seemed not unrea-

sonable, for it must be remembered that the bishop thus far had absolute power over the distribution of all the preachers, from Boston to Savannah, there having been yet no "cabinet" of presiding elders to assist in his appointments. We are not surprised, therefore, that, on the first appearance of the question, such men as Garrettson, Ware, Hull, Ivey, and Reed sustained O'Kelly. It should not be forgotten, also, that at this very time had commenced those debates in the British Conference, occasioned by the recent death of Wesley, which resulted in the reorganization of Wesleyan Methodism, with precisely the "appeal," advocated by O'Kelly, recognized as a constitutional right of every itinerant preacher, a right still maintained by Wesleyan Methodism throughout the world. But the Wesleyan ministry deemed no such right expedient while Wesley remained at their head; and Asbury was now, to American, what Wesley had been to British Methodism. The ecclesiastical system of the American Church had hitherto been, by common consent, a sort of military *régime;* only as such could it meet the peculiar wants of its vast, its new and ever-opening field. Its ministry was a volunteer corps; no one was constrained to remain in the ranks; they wisely chose to have an effective commandant, invested with decisive authority, and willing, as well as able, to throw them to any point of the great field, into any deadly breach; they demanded of him only that the victory be won. If they had an abstract right to O'Kelly's "appeal," they believed that they had also the right to waive that right, for the general good. Their vote, therefore, was not an act of servility; it was heroism. And then they knew also that the legislative power of the Church was in their own hands; they could qualify the episcopal prerogative whenever they should see it expedient to do so; their choice not to do so now was voluntary and admirable.

After the withdrawal of O'Kelly peace and the old brotherly spirit again pervaded the conference. Asbury, by request of his brethren, preached to them on the appropriate text of 1 Peter iii, 8: "Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous." He had preached his text during the session, by his example, and could now effectually preach it from the pulpit.

A solemn ordination of James Thomas and William Colbert, two itinerant pioneers, took place the day after O'Kelly's secession. On Thursday, the fifteenth and last day, the business being through, Coke preached before the conference on James i, 27, ("Pure religion," etc.) It was the befitting climax of the occasion; a profound feeling pervaded the assembly, "a solemn awe rested upon them." "The meeting was continued till about midnight," he says, "and twelve persons, we have reason to believe, were then adopted into the family of God. This was a glorious conclusion; a gracious seal from Heaven to our proceedings." *

He left the city with a higher estimate of the American itinerants than he had ever formed before. "We continued our conference," he says, "for fifteen days. I had always entertained very high ideas of the piety and zeal of the American preachers, and of the considerable abilities of many; but I had no expectation, I confess, that the debates would be carried on in so very masterly a manner; so that on every question of importance the subject seemed to be considered in every possible light. Throughout the whole of the debates they considered themselves as the servants of the people, and therefore never lost sight of them on any question. Indeed, the single eye, and the spirit of humility, which were manifested by the preachers throughout the whole of the conference, were extremely pleasing, and afforded a comfortable prospect of the increase of the work of God throughout the continent."

Asbury resumed his labors and travels, recording that "the conference ended in peace; my mind was kept in peace, and my soul enjoyed rest in the Stronghold." Lee says that "notwithstanding we had some close debates, and some distressing hours, and withal, some of our preachers were so offended as to leave the conference before the business was half finished, yet it was a comfortable time to most of us, and we were highly favored of the Lord with his presence and love in the last of our sitting. Our hearts were closely united together, and we parted in great union, love, and fellowship. Some of the preachers who came to the conference were quite dissatisfied; but at the close of the meeting they were perfectly

* Journals, p. 264.

reconciled, and returned to their circuits fully determined to spend and be spent in the work of the ministry, and in the fellowship of the Church."

The generous heart of Garrettson was deeply affected by the final spectacle of peace and brotherly love. At the close of the session he wrote: "O what a wonder to see so large a body of preachers gathered from all parts of the country, and like little children sitting at each others' feet, united as the heart of one man, and all engaged in one common cause, namely, to demolish the kingdom of Satan, and to build up that of the Redeemer! I retired to my room, not indeed alone, for I trust my blessed Saviour was with me. O my God, let me rather die than cease to love thee."* Ware has left a favorable testimony of the session, though he says, probably in allusion to some personal treatment in the debates, that "some of the painful sensations I felt, during it, have caused me at times to wish I could forget there had been such a meeting;" but he adds, "we went through our business amicably; and there was a gracious work of revival in the congregations throughout the city. As to the conference, I was pleased with the spirit in which its business was transacted."†

Some serious consequences were, however, to follow these transactions. Lee's prophecy that O'Kelly would not remain quiet, but would become the head of a party, was to be verified. He had long lived on the borders between Virginia and North Carolina. His influence swayed the ministry and people, on both sides, all along that line. He had been a devout and zealous man; an eloquent preacher; a strenuous Methodist; a tireless laborer as presiding elder; a heroic opposer of slavery, enforcing the antislavery‡ law of the Church. Yet his restless temper had led him into conflict with Asbury some time before the conference of 1792.§

He was now a veteran, broken with age. He was an

* Bangs's Garrettson, p. 207. † Life, etc., p. 222.

‡ He not only preached against slavery, but published "An Essay on Negro Slavery," Philadelphia, 1789, the first American Methodist publication of the kind that I can recall.

§ Asbury's Journals, ii, p. 69. He had professed perfect reconciliation, however, with the bishop a year before the conference. (See p. 134.)

Irishman; his temperament was fiery, and, as usual with such temperaments, his conscience was weak, easily swayed by his prejudices, weak to yield to them, though strong to defend them. He returned to Virginia prepared to upturn the foundations he had helped to lay. Asbury hastened thither also, and held a conference in Manchester. Already O'Kelly had begun his pernicious work; some of the most devoted people and preachers had been disaffected; and, in this day, we are startled to read that William M'Kendree, afterward one of the saintliest bishops of the Church, and Rice Haggard, sent to Asbury "their resignations in writing." The conference knew the infirmities of O'Kelly, and was inclined to forbearance; it resolved to permit the disaffected itinerants still to preach in its pulpits. It compassionated the veteran leader, and, says Asbury, "as he is almost worn out, the conference acceded to my proposal of giving him forty pounds per annum, as when he traveled in the connection, provided he would be peaceable and forbear to excite divisions." He accepted the offer; used the money for some time; but at last relinquished his claim, and devoted himself, with his characteristic zeal, to the promotion of schism. The refusal of the conference to qualify the episcopal power to appoint the preachers was his ostensible argument. It was plausible, but not logical, in the peculiar circumstances of the Church. It was quite irrelevant to himself personally. "For himself," writes Asbury, "the conference well knew he could not complain of the regulation. He had been located to the south district of Virginia for about ten successive years; and upon his plan might have located himself, and any preacher, or set of preachers, to the district, whether the people wished to have them or not."

It was a period of general excitement in Virginia by the political contests of the Republicans and Federalists, the former being the dominant party. O'Kelly adroitly availed himself of these party agitations, and formed his associates into a Church with the title of "Republican Methodists." Their organization gave them a temporary power, and disastrous results followed. They held "conference after conference," devising a system of church government; but insubordination reigned among them. In 1793 they had a number of societies, but, says the

historian of the times,* they were "formed on a leveling plan."

All were to be on an equal footing. One preacher was not to be above another, nor higher in office or in power than another. No superiority or subordination was to be known among them. They promised to the lay members of the Church greater liberties than they had formerly enjoyed among us, and prevailed with a good many of our people to leave us and join them. In some places they took off from us whole societies together, and in many places they drew off a part. Others they threw into confusion; and in some places they scattered the flock and separated the people one from the other, without securing them to their own party. They took a few meeting-houses from us, and preached in them themselves; and some houses we left and would not preach in them, in order to avoid contentions. The disaffected party then began to pour out a flood of abuse against us, to ridicule us, and to say all manner of evil against us; and withal, they took unjustifiable steps in order to set our members against the preachers. The divisive spirit prevailed more in the south parts of Virginia than in any other place. There were some of our societies in the northeast part of North Carolina who felt the painful effects of the division, and were considerably scattered and greatly injured. Several of our local preachers and many of our private members were drawn off from us, and turned against us. The societies were brought into such troubles and difficulties that they knew not what to do. Many that were drawn off from us would not join with the other party. Brother was turned against brother, and one Christian friend against another. The main contention was about the government of the Church; who should govern it, or in what manner it ought to be governed. In this mist of darkness and confusion, many religious people, who had been warm advocates for the life and power of religion, began to contend about Church government, and neglect the duties of religion, till they were turned back to the world, and gave up religion altogether. It was enough to make the saints of God weep between the porch and the altar, and that both day and night, to see how "the Lord's flock was carried away captive" by that division. These preachers who turned aside from the truth did abundance of mischief among the people that were not religious, many of whom became so deeply prejudiced against religion and religious professors that they would hardly attend on preaching at all. It might well be said, "Without were fightings, and within were fears."

In 1793 they held a conference in Mannakin Town, Va., the scene of a former dissentient Methodist assembly, in the famous "sacramental controversy." They there framed a con-

* Lee, p. 203.

stitution, and O'Kelly, as their leader, ordained their preachers. In 1801 they discarded their laws and title and assumed the name of "*The* Christian Church," renouncing all rules of Church government but the New Testament, as interpreted by every man for himself. O'Kelly had published a pamphlet attacking Asbury and the Methodist Episcopal Church.* Asbury collected documents for a reply and presented them to the conference, which appointed one of its ablest members, Nicholas Snethen, to prepare them for publication. He issued "A Reply to an Apology," etc., to which O'Kelly responded in "A Vindication of an Apology." Snethen rejoined in "An Answer to James O'Kelly's Vindication of his Apology." Asbury's administration appears unimpeachable in Snethen's pages. In referring to his accusers the bishop says: "I bid such adieu, and appeal to the bar of God. I have no time to contend, having better work to do. If we have lost some children, God will give us more. Ah! this is the mercy, the justice of some, who, under God, owe their all to me and my *tyrants*, so called. The Lord judge between them and me."

The war of pamphlets ended, though Lee also prepared, in part, a manuscript reply to O'Kelly;† but the internecine war went on disastrously for some years. It occasioned "a great falling away from the Church." "In the years of its greatest influence, 1793–4–5, there was a clear loss in the membership of 7,352. But, although this loss was so great, there is no sufficient reason to believe 'The Republican Methodists,' as they were then called, had met with corresponding success. It has been the aim of some writers to show that there were numerous accessions to Methodism during this period, and that the loss of the Church was so much greater in proportion to the amount of these accessions; and that therefore the gain of O'Kelly was proportionally great. But this argument is unsupported by any facts we have been able to discover.‡

It was impossible, however, that a schism so badly managed could long succeed. It broke into parties; several of its preachers fell away from it and formed a new "plan of their own in Charlotte County, Va.;" many individual members

* "The author's Apology for Protesting against the Methodist Episcopal Church Government."—*Lee's Life of Lee*, p. 276. Dr. Lee gives a full account of the schism.

† It is able and conclusive. Dr. Lee inserts it at p. 278. ‡ Ibid.

and preachers, tired of the conflict, sought peace again in the parent Church; and Lee, writing in 1809, says: "They have been divided and subdivided, till at present it is hard to find two of them that are of one opinion. There are now but few of them in that part of Virginia where they were formerly the most numerous; and in most places they are declining."

Ten years after O'Kelly's revolt Asbury met him again in Winchester, Va. The bishop notes in his Journal, August 20, 1802, that, "Mr. O'Kelly having been taken ill in town, I sent two of our brethren, Reed and Wells, to see him, by whom I signified to him that if he wished to see me I would wait on him: he desired a visit, which I made him on Monday, August 23. We met in peace, asked of each other's welfare, talked of persons and things indifferently, prayed and parted in peace. Not a word was said of the troubles of the former times. Perhaps this is the last interview we shall have upon earth."

Bangs* supposes this interview was "near the close of O'Kelly's life," and expresses the hope that he died reconciled and "forgiven." Asbury's Journals, however, show that for years later the energetic seceder still fought his hopeless battle. In 1805 the bishop, passing through Virginia, writes: "Mr. O'Kelly has come down with great zeal, and preaches three hours at a time upon government, monarchy, and episcopacy; occasionally varying the subject by abuse of the Methodists, calling them aristocrats and Tories; a people who, if they had the power, would force the government at the sword's point. Poor man!"

He survived till the 16th of October, 1826, when he died in his ninety-second year, retaining "to the latest period of his life unabated confidence in the purity and power of his system. In age and feebleness his hope in the work of his hands did not desert him. He went down to the grave, according to one of his followers, satisfied with the past, and peaceful and trustful with respect to the future."†

Singularly devoted, romantically chivalric as were these primitive itinerants, still they were but men. Their human infirmities were oftener revealed in their personal or private relations, than in their public connections with the great cause

* Hist. M. E. Church, vol. i, 355.

† Lee's Life of Lee, p. 287, and also an obituary by Rev. John P. Lemay, attached to an edition of the Apology, published in Hillsborough, N. C., in 1829.

for which they labored, and therefore came but seldom within the purview of the historian. It seems indeed providential that, uneducated, enthusiastic, not to say superstitious, as not a few of them were, their individual weaknesses and eccentricities so rarely touched their public work. The extraordinary *régime* of their ministerial system doubtless held them in check, and exhausted their superabundant energy in systematized and beneficent labors. The first and purest of men fell in Paradise; David fell at the head of God's elect people; Judas and Peter in the apostolic band. Some of these good men also fell. Our Church history records examples of their downfall into fanatic insanity, schism, intemperance, and, in one instance, even into murder. Such cases were indeed surprisingly few, and quite exceptional to their general fidelity and sanctity; but to omit them from our ecclesiastical memorials would be to write romance, not history, and to suppress the important lesson, taught not only in Holy Scripture, but in all ecclesiastical history, that "all these things happened unto them for examples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world have come. Wherefore let him that standeth take heed lest he fall."

We have thus endeavored, with what success the reader must judge, to ascertain the true chronological position of the second General Conference, and to restore, in a somewhat definite form, its doings. It has already been remarked that we have a standard publication of the journals of this supreme body of the Church. They form a substantial collection of indispensable records—indispensable for our history and law—in five stout octavos. But they have an inadmissible defect; they begin with the session of 1796, and therefore omit the two most important sessions of the series—the original or Christmas session, at which we began our formal Church existence, and the "first regular General Conference," from which all the subsequent sessions date. The editors are not responsible for this deficiency; they followed instructions, and confined themselves to the manuscripts in the General Conference chest. But our "Book Concern" should provide for the supply of this lack. All the essential records of the great Christmas Conference can be had from its official publications, and, with little editing, could be made a fitting opening portion of this

important series of volumes. With somewhat more editorial attention the doings of the second session could be substantially restored. The two should make the introductory volume of the series, and would thus perfect it. Some of our General Conference editors should be charged with this important service to the Church.

---

## Art. II.—BUSHNELL'S VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.

*The Vicarious Sacrifice, Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation.* By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

There are some undertakings too difficult for the clearest intellect; some, impossible to the sturdiest logic. To so construct a *supernatural* religion that it shall be *only natural;* to maintain a *vicarious* sacrifice which shall be *void* of all *vicariousness;* an *atonement* which is *not* an atonement, and a *redemption* which does not *redeem*, is an undertaking which Dr. Bushnell has carried on to a success that lacks only the *succeeding.* His argument is limited to the peculiar force and personality of his style. For five hundred and fifty pages he stoutly maintains both sides of the tenet of *expiation*, or *satisfaction of justice*, by retaining as sacred all the *terms* of Scripture and orthodoxy, and by taking out of them all the meaning of Scripture and orthodoxy, so that he ends where he begins. But he leaves the careful reader in possession of two advantages: first, the inherent uniqueness and strength of the orthodox view of the atonement, illustrated by the shifts and weakness of its ablest adversaries; for the theory of Dr. Bushnell is manifestly too weak to carry him and too heavy to be carried by him; and, second, a clear view of the *moral power* of the atonement, which is by *no means excluded* by the recognition of the *claims and satisfaction of justice.* Without making a direct assault, or laying a systematic siege for capturing the strongholds of Christian doctrine, he causes the spiteful guerrillas of figure and innuendo to so swarm about the garrisons as to convince the careless observer that all the country is possessed by his forces, though, in fact, the

forts, the strategy, the bases of supply, are unassailed and unassailable.

It is difficult to determine which he hates most cordially, infidelity or orthodoxy. He says on the very *first* page of the body of his work: "And which of the two is the *greater wrong* and *most* to be *deplored*, that by which the fact itself" (Christ's work) "is rejected, or that by which it is made fit to be rejected, I will not stay to discuss." And our author could see the Church fall rather than believe Luther's statement of justification by faith. (P. 439.) This is his animus.

The Introduction is the presentation of a NEW ecclesiastical *father* under an *old name*. *Bushnell's* Anselm is not the *Church's* Anselm, nor yet *Anselm's* Anselm. Bushnell's Anselm has to do *only* with "consequences turning on the consideration of what is 'becoming,' 'due to God's honor,' necessary to save Him from magisterial 'weakness.'"—P. 18. But the *real* Anselm insists on the *punishment* of the sinner as the condition of "God's being JUST *to himself*." Again, our *author's* Anselm rejects *in toto* any satisfaction to justice. "Indeed, the idea of a penal suffering in Christ, and a satisfaction made thereby to retributive justice, *is expressly rejected as a thing too revolting to be thought of*."—P. 19. And the passage from the *Cui Deus Homo*, is quoted as proof of this remarkable statement: "Where is the justice of delivering to death for a sinner a man most just of all men? What man would not be condemned himself who should condemn the innocent to free the guilty?" p. 19. Dr. Bushnell ought to have noticed that this is not the sentiment of Anselm, but of his objecting, seeking pupil, Baso, and that the master answers it in the context. No wonder that our *author's* Anselm, "at points further on, appears to be a little clouded or obscure, where satisfaction turns more on the *death* and less on the *obedience* of Christ."—P. 21. Once more, Bushnell's Anselm makes the *death* of Christ *no essential* part of his work, *only an incident*. (P. 22.) But the *real* Anselm held, not only to the *obedience*, but also to the *death* of Christ. Read his *Cui Deus Homo*, or his "direction" for the visitation of the sick, (*Opera* i, 683. Ed. Migne,) where he says to the sick, "Go to, then, and whilst thy soul abideth in thee put *all* thy confidence in this *death*" (of Christ) "alone; place thy trust in *no other* thing; commit thyself wholly to this *death;*

cover thyself wholly with *this* alone; cast thyself wholly on this *death;* wrap thyself wholly in this *death;*" and much more of the same. Had Bushnell charged his theory to *Socinus*, instead of Anselm, it would have been less embarrassing to the facts.

Dr. Bushnell divides his book into four parts. Part I. "*Nothing superlative in vicarious sacrifice, or above the universal principles of right and duty.*" By an adroitly loose and ambiguous definition he includes the *Eternal Father*, the *Holy Spirit*, the *good angels*, and *all souls redeemed* in the same *vicarious sacrifice*. Part II. "*The life and sacrifice of Christ is what he does to become a renovating and saving power.*" Part III. "*The relations of God's law and justice to his saving work in Christ.*" Part IV. "*Sacrificial symbols and their uses.*"

The aim of the book is to show that Christ's work was simply and solely to renew humanity, to work a new life, and had *no reference, in any way*, to the satisfaction of justice; simply "to bring us out of our sins themselves, and *so* out of their penalties."—P. 41. There is no incurred penalty requiring attention. Justice has no claims to be met. The sinner needs only to throw down his arms, and he is, in that fact, fully reconstructed. Justice does not enter into the case at all, save that, so far as the sinner *refuses* to be reconstructed, so far justice does not reconstruct him. Any satisfaction to justice is denounced as the greatest outrage upon "every strongest sentiment of our nature," (p. 41;) "*would satisfy nothing but the very worst injustice.*"—P. 46. To maintain the Socinian view, it is necessary to deny the substitution of Christ in the place of the sinner; to bring Christ *under obligations* to do and suffer what he did; to identify God and man as "fellow-natures;" to make justice the *creature* of the divine *will;* to deny any reconciliation on the part of God, and the necessity of Christ's death; to give *new* and *arbitrary* renderings of all the Scriptures on the work of Christ; to take the meaning out of such terms as redemption, atonement, propitiation, reconciliation, bought with a price, and the like, and to give another system of sacrifice as a substitute for the system given to the Jews. This is the work before our author, and he enters upon it with a courage worthy of a better cause.

Let us consider his underlying principles.

I. CONCERNING THE DEFINITION AND USE OF THE TERM VICARIOUS.

Our author undertakes an explanation of the word *vicarious* that promises results in harmony with the meaning it has with all other writers. "It is the same word in the root as the word *vice* in vicegerent, vicar, vice-general, vice-president, and the like. It is a word that carries *always* a face of substitution. . . . Thus a vice-president is one who is to act, in certain contingencies, *as* and *for* the president. . . . Any person acts vicariously, in this view, just so far as he comes in place of another."—P. 39. All this drives steadily forward the orthodox view that Christ's vicarious suffering is in our stead, for us, as we were under sentence of death. He died for us, that we might live. This will not suit Dr. Bushnell, so he concludes from all this definition, that "Christ, in what is called his vicarious sacrifice, *simply* engages, at the expense of great suffering, and even of death, to bring us out of our sins, and so out of their penalties."—P. 41. Vicarious suffering is nothing more than sympathy. God takes us on his burdened feeling, as the mother carries her child on her feeling. (P. 47.) That is, in brief, vicarious means, "in the place of another," "in the stead of another;" *therefore* vicarious sacrifice *does not mean* sacrifice in the place of another, sacrifice in the stead of another: a *non sequitur*. The argument in support of this use of "vicarious" is more adroit than satisfactory. It is based on Matthew viii, 17: "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." Bushnell says Matthew quotes a verse "from the *stock chapter*, Isaiah liii, whence all the vicarious language of the New Testament is drawn," (p. 43,) and applies it to Christ casting out devils and healing the sick. Christ's relation to our diseases, therefore, determines his relation to our sins. We are asked, "Does it mean that he had our sicknesses transferred to him, and so taken off from us? . . . that he became blind for the blind, and the like. No one had ever such a thought. How, then, did he bear our sicknesses, or in what sense? In the sense that he took them on his feeling."—Pp. 43, 44. This is the way he bore our sins, namely, on his feeling, by way of sympathy. Does this strike bottom? Is it exhaustive?

All sickness and suffering is the fruit, the consequence, of sin; so that Christ bearing our sins bears our sicknesses and sufferings, in their *cause*, and thus, in the truest sense, fulfills the prophecy. As our substitute he has taken our diseases upon him, in that he has taken their *cause*, our *sin*, upon him. Thus it was fitting that he should manifest his relation to the *cause* by removing the *effects*, diseases. He did not take our diseases upon him in any surface sense, as having them as results of a deeper *cause* put upon him. But in the deeper and scriptural sense of taking upon him their *cause, he did* "take our infirmities and bear our sicknesses." To designate the 53d of Isaiah as a "stock chapter" is not sufficient to turn away the force of its clear, explicit statements of Christ's substitution in our place. Our author might better reject this 53d chapter of Isaiah and the word "*vicarious*;" his theory would then be less embarrassed. Why not reject the word instead of assassinating it? It has become so radically essential to Christian doctrine as taught in Scripture, and as demanded in the conscious want of guilty humanity, that to abandon it and the idea it contains would be to insure rejection. But which is the more to be distrusted, a *wolf*, or a wolf *in sheep's clothing?* Holding to our author's exposition (p. 39) and rejecting his use (p. 41) of the word vicarious, his Part I falls helpless in spite of his shifts and stout show of affirmations. And his view of the Eternal Father, the Holy Spirit, the good angels, and all souls redeemed in vicarious sacrifice, goes by the board.

### II. CONCERNING GOD AND MAN AS FELLOW-NATURES.

Another radical error underlying our author's *theory*, and cropping out here and there, is the assumption that the Creator and the creature are of *one nature*, under the *same law*, under the *same obligations*. This is gratuitously assumed. *No attempt* is made to prove this dogma. We are continually met with such declarations as these:

> We must bring everything back to *common standards* of eternal virtue, and we must find Christ doing and suffering just what he ought.—P. 38. What we call the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is *nothing strange* as regards the principle of it, no *superlative*, unexampled, and *therefore* unintelligible grace. . . . Nothing is want-

ing to resolve the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus but the *commonly* known and always familiar principle of love.—P. 48. It is very true that we are not to set ourselves up as redeemers of the world. Our petty measures of quantity and character forbid such a thought, *just as* any feeble and low man would be only absurd in attempting what is given to some most qualified and strongest man *of his own species.*—P. 124. [God and man in *one species*, only God is the greater.] They are *fellow-natures* with himself.—P. 244.

These citations might be extended indefinitely, for his theory rests on this principle. But enough have been cited to show that the theory vaults to the Infinite, and handles his character as if he were an equal or a menial. A theory that is compelled to mount so high for a footing is in danger of not securing a footing. Is it true that there is no difference, except in degree, between the Creator and the being created? Does not a nature that is *self-existent*, containing all things in itself, differ from a nature absolutely dependent and derived? Is there no gulf between the finite and the Infinite? To state such a theory is to refute it.

Suppose we revert to the famous point of "right" in "obligation" to which the oneness of the Creator and the creature is most frequently asserted. Is the "obligation" the *same* for each? Is the "*right*" the same? Man's obligation and whole duty is to love his Maker supremely and his neighbor as himself. Is this God's duty and obligation? Man must serve his Maker, must God? When Christ sums up man's duty he does not mention any abstract law of right. All he recognizes, though in harmony with the law of right, is contained in man's relations as a *creature*, and does not even hint at any obligation that might rest upon an independent being. When man has done *all*, he is an unprofitable servant. Is this true of God? The cardinal law of Bushnell's book must be abandoned, because it is as unscriptural as it is revolting. And with this disappears again his famous dogma of "all good beings in vicarious sacrifice."

### III. CONCERNING CHRIST'S MEETING STANDARD OBLIGATION.

Another peculiar view of our author, growing out of the last mentioned, is, that Christ, in all he did and suffered, was only meeting standard obligations. He says:

We must find Christ doing and suffering just what he ought, or felt that he ought, neither more nor less. . . . Do we then assume that Christ in his vicarious sacrifice was *under obligation* to do and suffer just what he did? *Exactly this.*—P. 58. When Jesus, in his sacrifice, takes our lot upon his feeling, and goes even to the cross for us, we need also to conceive that he does this for the *right*, and *because* the *everlasting word* of *righteousness* COMMANDS him.—P. 171.

He says of Christ's work to save sinners, his sorrows, sufferings, and sacrifices:

*All this in eternal obligation.*—P. 308. There is *nothing optional*, as many conceive, in his sacrifice. . . . In it he is just as good as he is in *obligation* to be.—P. 311. Christ came just because the *law* he had been in from eternity *sent* him, and his incarnate appearing was but the *necessary* outcoming in time of God's eternal love.—P. 315.

Exactly what is meant by this "obligation" that *necessitated* an outcoming in time, is not very clear. The assertion that "it is not an obligation to another, but to himself," (p. 58,) does not relieve it. This is certain, that in Dr. Bushnell's view this obligation to himself was so absolute that "there was nothing optional in his sacrifice;" that his incarnation and suffering were "*necessary*."

1. We object to this view that *it makes God a mere machine.* If language means anything, this establishes a sublime fatalism over the divine administration. God is bowed under a nameless fate or *necessity;* man only is free.

2. We object to it that it *does not cover all the facts in the case.* If God is obligated, by his nature, to redeem man as a fallen race, the same obligation "commands" him to redeem fallen angels as a fallen race. But Inspiration declares that "the angels which kept not their first estate. . . . He hath *reserved* in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."

3. We object to it that it contradicts the teachings of Scripture. When man has done all, he is an unprofitable servant; when Christ has done all, is he an unprofitable servant? And by what "common standard" can it be right for all redeemed souls to sing, "Thou art worthy. . . . for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy *blood.* . . . Worthy is the lamb that was *slain* to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing?"

4. We object to it that it is *opposed to the same authority upon which it rests*, namely, Dr. Bushnell's word. We have this dogma on the sole authority of Dr. Bushnell, and he says, "Perhaps it is better not to say that he is under law, lest we associate some constraint or limitation, but that he is in it."——P. 308. Again, "There was *no constraint* in the obligation, it is true.—P. 310. Which is true: that "there *was no constraint*," or that there is "*nothing optional* in his sacrifice," and that it "was the *necessary* outcoming" of his love? Either one position or the other, or both, or neither is true. If the fatalism is true, why not the freedom? Both rest on the same authority, namely, Dr. Bushnell's word, and *vice versa*. If both are true, what, then, is the character of God's action in redemption? It is neither constrained, nor optional, that is not constrained. But every action is either constrained or not constrained, that is, optional, as every thing is, logically, either Cæsar or not Cæsar. Therefore this action is simply *nothing*. If neither are true, then we are just where we were before this theory came to light. And, in any case, the orthodox view is unaffected so far as this theory is concerned.

This dogma of "Christ's meeting standard obligation," so necessary to Dr. Bushnell's theory for disposing of the merit of Christ's death, must be rejected, because it makes God a mere machine; because it does not cover all the facts in the case; because it contradicts the teachings of Scripture; and because it commits suicide in the author's brain and is born dead.

### IV. CONCERNING THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN "LAW BEFORE GOVERNMENT" AND LAW IN "INSTITUTED GOVERNMENT."

The work to be done, without which our author's theory cannot stand a moment, is to get rid of justice. This disposed of, there is no more need of satisfying it, and his theory is inaugurated in power. To accomplish the work of making justice a *variable thing*, the creature of the divine will, a matter which God is at liberty to exercise or not, as he sees fit, our author is forced to an invention, the only merit of which is its originality. It is the arbitrary *distinction between "law before government," and "law in instituted government."* This law before government is the eternal law of right, to which God and all creatures are in everlasting obligation.

"God's own nature was in law, or crystalizing in eternal obligation. . . . The law was *ideal*, not governmental, a simple *thought*, . . . and this allegiance to an *idea*, namely, *right*, was his righteousness, the sum of all his perfections."—P. 235. All creatures are under this law, and if they keep it they will never come under instituted government. This law before government *contains no element of retributive action.* For he says, "*nothing is contrived in them* (creatures) *or the world to have a retributive action.*"—P. 241. Of course this must be denied, or justice will not relax its hold upon the throat of his theory.

If any race breaks through this law of right "it will suffer a *tremendous shock of recoil.* . . . We do not know that it suffers anything in the scale of desert, which is the common notion of justice; we only know that it receives a shock of *necessary pain.*"—P. 242. This is the teaching under the idea of law before government. Our author thus proceeds to fix all retributions, and retributive justice, in his "instituted government." This is "contrived" with penalties, and threats, and all devices, to drive men out of their sins. (P. 253.) Justice being contrived in instituted government, God is at liberty to use them or not. He is under no obligation to set in operation any positive forces. So he says "justice and penal sanctions are inaugurated with instituted government."—P. 255. "God *must* be righteous; God *will* be just."—P. 259. This brings Dr. Bushnell to the desire of his book, namely, that "justice is only a reason of polity by which God rules."—P. 259. Such is the invented distinction, and such its fruit. To state clearly such a distinction is to refute it. And there are many reasons why it is not true. We will cite only a few.

1. *It allows the fact of retribution to remain, and bases a theory on the mere denial of a name or word.* We are told that a race breaking through the law of right "will suffer a tremendous shock of recoil. There will be a terrible disjunction of order in their parts and powers, so that what they call their soul will be scarcely better than a wrangle of contrarieties, or a cage of growling antipathies. . . . It receives a shock of *necessary* pain."—P. 242.

What is all this in FACT but retributive action upon the sinner, on account of his sin? What more could retribution do?

We have the stubborn *fact*, and the mere change of the name is too insignificant for a basis of theology.

2. *It conceals the penalty till after the offense, or commits the blunder of an* EX POST FACTO *law;* or, *holding to the* FACT *of retribution and* CONCEALING *it, the dogma adds the blunder of an ex post facto, to the crime of deception.* If there is a hell of "*necessary pain*," it is monstrous to *conceal* it till after the offender is engulfed. But on the *denial* of the *word* retribution, the *fact* remaining, our author insists that the "contrivance," "invention," "inauguration of justice," "retributive sanctions," penalties and the like, are not instituted till *after* the offense. Keeping the law of right, the creature never comes under instituted government. And "a law with a penalty to a realm in perfect holiness would even be an impropriety, or *blamable* offense."—P. 322. That is, God's command to Adam, created in his own image and likeness, not to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, "for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," was a crime in God, so that Adam was under no obligation to obey. Stupendous results for a new theology!

3. The distinction *confounds law with mere advice.* The universal conception of law is, that it carries with it a penalty for the offender; otherwise it is only *advice*, to be followed or not, according to the convenience of the one advised.

4. The distinction, if *possible, is not in point.* It does not cover the case. As soon as any creature is created he is, in virtue of his existence as a creature, under relations and obligations *to his Creator.* These *Christ* makes his *whole duty.* These constitute government. Being in the divine character, it comes into exercise on occasion of the relation of Creator and creature. And we cannot think *creature, without* also thinking this relation, which involves government. Thus, the distinction of our author fails by the very conditions of its existence. We therefore reject this distinction between law before government, and law in instituted government, because it allows the *fact* of retribution to remain, denying only the name; because it *conceals* the penalty till after the offense; because it makes God the author of an *ex post facto* law; because it *confounds law with advice;* and because it

*cannot apply to the case.* Either of these is sufficient to destroy the dogma. How can it carry them all?

### V. CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTICE.

On this subject our author carries on his deception of using *old standard terms*, with *new* and *antagonistic meanings*, with a perfection that is almost an art. The art consists in *gradually* working off the standard meaning of terms, and insinuating *his own*, by informal and incidental movements toward his view, till he has established his own definitions by *his own previous use;* then he ventures on a statement assumed to be proven, and from this dashes on to results the most astounding. He undertakes to impugn justice, and bring the orthodox view of the atonement into ill repute. He says:

> If the total import of his cross is, that God's wrath is satisfied and the books made square, there is much to revolt the soul . . . and raise a chill of revulsion.—P. 30. The substitution of Christ for us offends every strongest sentiment of our nature.—P. 41. It would satisfy nothing but the *very worst injustice.*—P. 46. I do not undertake to show that Christ came to fill out any scheme of satisfaction or compensation.—P. 315. Not that he indorsed so much of suffering as having it penally upon him. *He has no such thought.*—P. 389. He suffers the curse they are justly under, . . . not to satisfy God's justice, but in a way of coming at their consciences and hearts.—P. 395.

To make room for these views our author invents the distinction between law before government and law in instituted government, which we considered in the last previous section, and deduces from it statements like the following: "Justice is *only a co-factor* with mercy."—P. 271. "God *must* be righteous; God *will* be just. . . . Justice is the reason of polity by which God rules."—P. 259. From this view of justice as the *creature* of the divine *will*, it is not difficult to put it aside when it is in the way of a theory. It follows quite easily that "there is *no such thing* in God, or any other being, as a kind of *justice which goes by the law of desert.*"—P. 270. Such justice need not be satisfied or compensated, could have no claims to be met, for it can be set aside and make large room for their Socinian theory. This view is absolutely essential to Dr. Bushnell's theory. It is the *heart* of the

whole matter. It *is the whole matter.* Therefore let us consider it.

1. We object to it because *it is not all that follows from his premises.* The argument of the book depends upon the statement that "God *will* be just, as distinguished from the formula that God *must* be just. While it is true that "God will be just," if it is also true that God *must* be just, all the deductions from the basis that God *merely will* be just are void. Bushnell says "God *must* be righteous," and "because he must be righteous he undertakes to be the vindicator of his violated law." Righteousness is an *absolute* term. Justice is a *relative* term. *In* or *out of* relations, God *must* be righteous. But *justice* being a relative term, depends upon the presence of the relation, so that we cannot say with technical accuracy, God *must* be just. Because he may exist out of relations, that is, when there is no other being, it will not be proper to say that he is then either just or unjust. But it does not follow that his justice is *only voluntary*, when the relation exists calling for justice or injustice. *Justice is the acting out of God's righteousness*, or more properly his holiness. Dr. Bushnell prefers the term righteousness; we will not demur. Therefore the same obligation that binds him to be righteous *in* or *out of* relations, binds him to be *just in relations.* Dr. Bushnell's conclusion should be, *God must be just in relations*, not, "God *will* be just." Further, the *occasion* of relations adds nothing to the divine character, therefore that which *comes* out as *justice*, on occasion of relations, call it righteousness or what we may, is eternally in God's character. In *fact*, God *must* be just. Technically speaking, God *must* be *just in relations.*

Dr. Bushnell's fallacy is like concluding that, because there can be only *one* shortest distance between two given points in space, therefore it is impossible for two lines to be parallel.

2. We object to this view of justice *because it removes the need of pardon.* If justice has no claims against us, then either there is nothing for which we need pardon, or *something* else has the claims against us denied to justice. If the *latter*, the *fact* of claims remains, only the *name* is changed, and we need a substitute as before. If the *former*, then *Christ's* command or instruction to pray "forgive us our debts,"

and all the Scripture on this subject of pardon, are opposed to this theory of our author.

3. We object to this view of justice because the distinction between "law before government" and "law in instituted government," upon which it rests, is utterly worthless and impossible, as shown above.

4. We object to this view of justice because it is opposed to the very same authority upon which it depends, namely, Dr. Bushnell's word.

BUSHNELL AGAINST JUSTICE *versus* BUSHNELL FOR JUSTICE.

There is no such thing in God, or any other being, as a kind of justice which goes by the law of desert. . . . There is no principle which any human being can state or even think, that obliges him, on pain of losing character, to do by the disobedient exactly as they deserve. The rule taken as a measure has no moral signification.—P. 270.

We conceive it to be a matter a great deal more definite than it is, to say that justice is the making the transgressor suffer what he deserves. Is it the divine justice to fly at evil doing and make it feel just as much evil as it practices.—P. 268.

[Such Scriptures as "Render to every man according to his deeds," and the "*lex talionis*," "For with what measure ye meet it shall be measured to you again," are toned down to suit the case by the convenient commonplace,] "In a certain *popular sense* this language is good."—P. 268.

Justice being, in the administration, a due infliction of such evil [evil in redress of wrong] according to the ill-desert of the wrong.—P. 380.

Justice moves on in the positive vigor of the wrath principle, girded with inflexible majesty for the doing upon wrong of what wrong deserves.—P. 367.

Christ begins with the declaration that no jot or tittle of the law shall fail, . . . and cannot close his first sermon without promulgating several times over the appalling doctrine of future punishment. This doctrine is as distinctively Christian as the forgiveness of sins. I do not of course imagine that the fact is new, but the doctrine is. The fact was in the law of natural retribution from the first, just as gravity was in the world before it was declared by science.—P. 342. Justice is a fixed principle of order, as truly as the laws of the heavenly bodies.—P. 282.

Exactly what sense, "popular" or otherwise, Dr. Bushnell gives to language is not clear. And it is still more doubtful which side of the question of justice he is on. We infer that he is on *both*, or rather that *he* is on *one* side and his *theory* on the *other*. At least it is fair to conclude that he is like HIS Luther, "*not one but two men, a Christian* and *a theologian*."—P. 437. And, further, we conclude, that if his *authority* is good it is a sufficient answer to his *theory*.

### VI. CONCERNING RECONCILIATION.

After what has been shown concerning our author's view of justice, it is but natural that he should be sorely and fatally at *fault* concerning reconciliation. The ground of his view being removed, it hardly seems necessary to enter upon any elaborate argument. We will only mention a few points.

1. "Reconciliation is a word of transformation wholly inapplicable to God, and, what is more, it is here even formally applied to us. . . . It is one thing to reconcile the world and a very different thing to reconcile God."—P. 165. What is the Scripture idea of reconciliation? Clearly that the offender does somewhat to reconcile him whom he has offended. Thus the Philistines say of David, "Whereunto should he reconcile himself to his master?"—1 Sam. xxix, 4. He had offended Saul and needed to pacify him, yet he is said "*to reconcile himself to his master.*" Christ says, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy *brother hath aught against thee.* . . . first be *reconciled to thy brother* and then come."—Matt. v, 23, 24. The person addressed is the offender and can have *nothing against his brother.* But his *brother* had *something against him;* yet he is exhorted TO BE RECONCILED TO HIS BROTHER. Has God offended man, or has man offended God? We leave the question of the use of language between our author and his Master.

2. The suffering of the innocent for the guilty is denounced as *unjust* and *impossible.* "It would revolt the soul."—P. 30. "It would satisfy nothing but the very worst injustice."—P. 46. "He is going, in fact, to overturn all relations of desert, by taking pains *not deserved* to release pains that are."—P. 492. "A punishment sticks immovably to the wrong-doer, and no commutation, expiation, or transfer of places can remove it."—P. 493.

To this view, as old as Basilides, (A. D. 125,) we need hardly answer. It has been so often refuted that it seems almost a shame to drag it out of its grave again. But since it is out, and its skeleton clatters at us from the pages of this *new book*, let us give it another decent burial.

That we inherit disabilities, evils, burdens, woes, from our

parents, is an admitted fact. If it is unjust, or against the divine plan, that any other being should take away from us any of the consequences of our guilt, it must also be unjust, and against the divine plan, that any other being should have brought upon us any of the consequences of his guilt. Surely God would rather take away consequences of guilt, of which we are sick, by the voluntary intervention of another, than burden us with consequences of another's guilt, involuntarily aimed at us, which we do not wish to inherit. Thus we read: "Therefore, as by the *offense* of *one*, *judgment* came upon *all men* to condemnation, EVEN SO by the *righteousness* of *one*, the *free gift* came upon *all men* unto *justification* of life." Rom. v, 18.

Again, as a matter of fact, the question of justice, in reference to the suffering of Christ, is *not* one of *degree*, but one of *fact*, not *how much* he suffered, but, *did he suffer at all?* A solitary insult offered him by any sinner, a single look of scorn from any proud Jew, involves the whole question of justice. The whole plan of our author is under the same objection. If the *just* suffered for the unjust, we are plunged into this difficulty, if it be one. The change of *name* does not change the fact. In both the Old and New Testaments every suffering is regarded a punishment. It is the "wages of sin" from the very dawn of revelation. *Christ suffered*: therefore, either he suffered *vicariously, that is, in the place of others or another*, or *he suffered as being himself a sinner.* Choose ye.

*Compelling* Christ to suffer, by an *eternal necessity*, does not commend itself to the "moral sense" of "any right-thinking mind," any more than his *voluntcering* to suffer. The new *theory* must carry all the old burdens, augmented by many new ones. Again. As to the transfer of guilt, so as to treat an innocent person *as if he were* guilty, for no one makes Christ guilty, *in fact*, as Dr. Bushnell insinuates, is it without example in the divine action? If so, how came Canaan under the burden of Ham's transgression? Why were seventy thousand of Israel slain for David's sin? How fared it with the children of Achan? God approved of the execution of seven sons of Saul for Saul's guilt? This is old ground. The path is beaten hard and rutted deep. If one cannot follow it as it is, he is too blind to see any foot-prints we may make.

3. Let us consider at this point our author's view of Christ's death. He maintains that Christ *died incidentally.* Doing a right work, he so persisted in it that he died just as any missionary dies in his work. "The conception is, that he comes into the world, not simply to be murdered, or as being commanded of the Father to die, but that having a specially right work laid upon him by the Father, he is able rather to die for it than to renounce it."—P. 20. "He expected that dying for his work would give eloquence and power to his mission, just because, *not coming here to die*, he would have it put upon him as the cost of his fidelity."—P. 131.

The statement of such a dogma immediately suggests much Scripture to the contrary. "I *lay down* my *life* for the sheep." "Christ was once *offered* to bear the sins of many." "While we were yet sinners Christ *died* for us." "In whom we have redemption through his *blood*." "Christ *died* for the ungodly." "If one *died* for all." After the resurrection, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things." Οὐχὶ ἔδει, *was it not necessary.* Surely *Christ's death* was *no incidental* matter in the view of *Inspiration.*

### VII. CONCERNING INTERPRETATION.

The theory of our author is not more out of harmony with the faith of the Church, than his interpretation is opposed to the general judgment, both of evangelical and of rationalizing exegetes. We have no disposition to go into a detailed examination of passages, and we have not space to produce a commentary, nor to collect the opinions of exegetes. It will be sufficient to give Dr. Bushnell's principles of interpretation as illustrated in his own style:

> Suppose some state has contrived a prison for the punishment of public malefactors on the plan of an ordeal by Providence. The prison is placed in the region of some deadly miasma, the design being to let every convict go free after some given numbers of years are passed. . . . Finally, it comes to the knowledge of a certain *good monk*, . . . that a notable prisoner, who, a long time ago, was his bitter private enemy, begins to show the working of the poison, . . . whereupon the godly servant says, "This man was my enemy, and for Christ's sake I must go to him, trying, if I can, to save him." Becoming thus the prisoner's faithful nurse and attendant, he is recovered and goes free, and the benefactor takes the infection and dies. And now the rescued man throws

out his soul on words, trying vainly to express the inexpressible tenderness of his obligation. He writes, and talks, and sings nothing but gratitude all his life long, telling how the christly man saved him, by what poor figures he can raise. "O, he bore my punishment," "became the criminal for me," "gave his life for mine," "died that I might live," "stood in my lot of guilt," "suffered all my suffering." . . . Then after a time, when he and his benefactor are gone, some one undertakes to write their story, and the dull, blind-hearted literalizer takes up all these *forms of expression* in the letters and reported words of the recovered felon, showing most conclusively from them that the good *monk* actually got the other's crime imputed to him, took the guilt of it, . . . died in his place. . . . The honors won for Christian theology by this kind of interpretation put upon the *free words* of Scripture make a very sad figure, and are better to be lost than preserved. I do not, to speak frankly, know a passage of Scripture that can, with *any fairness*, be turned to signify a legal or judicial substitution of Christ in the place of the transgressor; none that, taken with *only a proper Christian intelligence*, can be understood as affirming either the fact or the necessity of a compensation made to God's justice for the release of sin.—Pp. 399, 398.

Comment is hardly necessary. Passing over in silence the almost blasphemy of calling the Son of God a monk, and intimating that he takes the infection and dies, let us attend to the point in hand, his style of interpretation. A theory must be sorely pressed, to base its defense upon the affirmation that the clear, scholarly, accurate, logical *statements* of *doctrine* by such a mind as St. Paul's, and that, too, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, are only "*fervors of expression*," only "*free words*," gushings of a gratitude in direct antagonism to the truth, saying "Christ died for us," when, in fact, he did not *die* for us. Strange inspiration, teaching that "Christ bore our sins in his own body upon the tree," when he did no such thing.

The weight of learning and sanctified research that has accumulated for eighteen centuries in support of the orthodox view of the atonement, would seem to be sufficient to prevent any "right-thinking man" from affirming that no "fairness," no "proper Christian intelligence," can find a single passage to support the orthodox view of the atonement. *Surely here is another speaking "with authority."* To such clever assumption nothing is impossible. The above is the key to our author's style of interpretation, not let slip from his pen without having been weighed, but carefully con-

structed and approvingly referred to later in the work. (P. 479.) It is on this key that he disposes of Isaiah liii. He admits that "these are all figures that refer more or less clearly to judicial and penal processes, as if Christ, the subject, were somehow positively handled in our place."—P. 478. But he tries to parry its force by saying that "the whole chapter is from the point of gratitude. . . . It is the witness of a tender confession, *not a prophecy* save in that form."—P. 479. Nothing but "a *figure* to express tender acknowledgment."—P. 479. This disposition of Isaiah lii and liii certainly must brand Dr. Bushnell's argument with absolute worthlessness, when we remember that Christ and his apostles refer to this section more frequently and more emphatically than to any other part of the Old Testament. They everywhere regarded it as *a prophecy* that must be *fulfilled.* If by prophecy we understand the declaration of an event before the event, or "the *foretelling of an event*," this "stock chapter" is a prophecy. From the analogy of the *new* meanings of such words as "vicarious," "propitiation," "atonement," "redemption" "reconciliation," and the like, no man can tell what is meant by prophecy. So that in this *new* lexicon, this "stock chapter" may not be a prophecy. It may be a conundrum, or a pun, or a prayer.

Enough has been said to show the style of interpretation to which our author is driven. To see this in its strain and pressure is to reject it. If the Scriptures had designed to teach the substitution and penal suffering of the Messiah, they could not have selected stronger and clearer words for that purpose than the words used concerning him. Either Dr. Bushnell has been mistaken in his conception of the use of language, or the prophets, and the Master, and the apostles, were the most bungling linguists and teachers that ever tried to state a proposition or declare a truth. The words used in the Hebrew are even stronger than the words by which they are translated. נגע is to plague, a word having direct reference to suffering on account of guilt. Compare Psalm lxxiii, 14; 2 Kings xv, 5. In this last place Azariah is smitten with a plague, leprosy, which in the *law* is distinctly designated as a punishment of sin. So, also, the idea of guilt is almost crystalized in the word מוּכֶר, chastisement. This is very often the

punishment of the incorrigibly wicked, simple strokes of retributive justice, for example, Proverbs xv, 10; Jeremiah ii, 19. Surely the many strong terms of Isaiah cannot be vapored away into mere sympathy.

VIII. CONCERNING SACRIFICE.

Dr. Bushnell's views on this subject are also fitted to his theory. He has the old iron bedstead, and the Old Testament sacrifices must lie thereon. The head and feet refuse to come within the limits. But that is a slight embarrassment. A few strokes with the ax and they drop off. The brain and the understanding are gone, but the *dead* remnant fits the place. He endeavors to so prepare the way for this slaughter that it may be the least sacrilegious possible, and still be a slaughter. This commences by giving the Jewish sacrifices an equivocal or ambiguous origin. "They were instituted, doubtless, just as language, namely, by a divine instigation acting through human *instincts* and voices."—P. 453. Even this is toned down, or reduced to a point, by "man had in his nature a language *faculty*." So we are to receive sacrifices as the invention of a *sacrifice faculty*. Man felt a *want* and longed for communion with God. "Observing how it was the way of smoke to rise up heavenward," he took the "hint," (p. 453,) and proceeded to sacrifice. The sacrifices were only intended to create a language in which to handle Christ. But it does not appear why any other system of sacrifices might not have done this as well, nor why any other people might not have handled Christ as well as the chosen people. He *denies all idea* of *expiation in the Jewish sacrifices*. "I am able, after a most thorough and complete examination of the Scriptures, to affirm with confidence that they exhibit *no trace of expiation*."—P. 496. "Expiation is a *pagan corruption* of the Jewish cultus."—P. 487. If this view is vital, in spite of the clear teaching of the Old Testament, where, in virtue of the offerings in making *atonement*, the guilty offense was "*forgiven*," and has survived the many fields in which it has been worsted and killed, it is immortal. It cannot be killed. It is as vain to strike through it with the sword of logic as it was to strike through Milton's fallen angels. Scholarly and honest rationalizing exegetes

have been unable to separate the orthodox, evangelical view of the sacrifices from the Old Testament, and have been compelled to reject such portions of the Scriptures. Surely such men as Gesenius, with as great a desire to be rid of this idea as Dr. Bushnell can have, are as good authority as he is. For it is *only* a question of authority concerning Bushnell's view. He gives us only his dictum, and we bury it beneath the dictum of scholars.

### IX. CONCERNING OTHER STATEMENTS.

Some other statements and views of our author are worthy of notice as involutions of his theory, and as rare specimens.

1. He assumes and insinuates continually, that orthodox theology limits the work of Jesus to "squaring the books."

It is not his simply to forgive, or obtain the forgiveness of sin in the lowest and most nearly negative sense of remission.—P. 153. They sigh after him with Thomas à Kempis, or rest in him with Brainerd, or sing him as the mighty power with Wesley, even though they know him in their *doctrine only* as a sacrifice before God's justice.—P. 161. According to the *common* conception, his declaration of the righteousness of God prepares a *ground* of remission, or a *ground* of justification. . . . Perhaps we shall find reason to believe that Christ is a great deal more to us than a *ground*.—P. 423.

*This is a twin to* HIS *view of Anselm.*

2. Christian justification has no reference whatever to justice under the political analogies, or to any compensation of justice.—P. 427. When we are justified by faith we are carried directly back into the recesses, so to speak, of God's eternity, back of all instituted government, back of the *creation*, back of the statutes and penalties, and the coming wrath of guiltiness, and all the continued machineries and means of grace, including, in a sense, the Bible itself.—P. 428.

That is, justification puts us into the same relations to God which we sustained to him *before we existed.* A *new* theory of annihilation.

3. He talks about "retributive frenzy," as if orthodox Christians held that God's purpose to punish sin were a passion.

4. We must *understand* the grace of Christ or *reject* it. He talks about Christ's work, saying that "it is no *superlative, unexampled,* and *therefore* unintelligible grace."—P. 48. "If

Christ was consenting, optionally, to what he might as well have declined, . . . then the surplus over is *anything or nothing;* we may call it merit, but we do not know what it is; we may balance it against the sins of the world, but we cannot be sure of a grain's weight in it."—P. 57. A sad doctrine for our poor, weak-minded humanity. Who, then, can be saved if we must understand Christ's grace before we can trust it, if we must comprehend the love that passeth knowledge before we apprehend it? Though it may be too deep for our faculties, may we not believe that Jesus was "God manifest in the flesh?" and that he is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth?" Who can understand how Christ's *life* can regenerate the heart, any better than how his *death* can satisfy justice?

These are only specimens of the principles and statements that meet us on almost every page. Our author has succeeded in collecting *more errors*, and *more false* doctrine, than we have ever met *in the same space.* But these are so adroitly put, so shrewdly advanced, that it requires some attention to detect the point of departure from the truth.

The spirit of the book is far beneath the author of "Nature and the Supernatural," or of the "Sermons of the New Life." But we trust the work may be used for some good in turning thought more steadily to the *moral power* of the atonement, if, despite the book, the Church still hold the redemptive character of Christ's death with a firm grasp. We came to this book with the memory of our author's former works strongly biasing us in its favor. Our disappointment was the greater because they gave us high hopes that the errors then advocated by the author might be ultimately abandoned. We are sorry that *Horace Bushnell* has brought himself to write this book and believe its teachings; sorry that one having the rare gift of such an attractive style should lend that gift to the enemies of the Saviour whom he loves; and sorry, above all, that any man, in any way, should count "the blood of the covenant an unholy thing."

## Art. III.—HERMENEUTICS AND HOMILETICS;

### or, the study of the original scriptures and preaching.

[article second.]

### § 8. Objections.

Two or three objections we think it proper to consider, which are frequently brought against the study of Greek and Hebrew.

1. *It takes so many years that one cannot possibly spare the time to study these languages.* We remark, that while we take it as a *rule* that ministers should study the original Scriptures, we at the same time admit of exceptions. Some men are not converted and called to the work of the ministry till late in life. In general such persons are excepted. Others, again, may be excepted on the ground of feeble health, having a constitution unable to bear the long-continued study implied in learning two languages. Others, again, are in such straitened pecuniary circumstances, embarrassed with many and severe family cares; these too must be allowed to stand in the list of exceptions. For these and for other reasons it is often rendered inexpedient for some to enter upon the study of the original Scriptures, and yet no true minister of Jesus Christ, having the spirit of his Master, and of the great apostle, "coveting earnestly the best gifts," whatever be his circumstances, will regard it anything less than a misfortune that he cannot read God's word in the original tongues.

As to the objection that much time and labor are requisite to acquire a tolerable knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, we frankly say it is ordinarily so. This is especially true of Greek. Its forms are numerous, both of the noun and of the verb. And years of practice are necessary to translate and interpret it with facility. As to the Hebrew the case is very different. The forms of the language, both of the noun and the verb, are, compared with other languages, few in number and simple. We have known some students to become familiar with its regular forms in three months. Others, again, will scarcely accomplish this in as many years. There is a great difference in men. But this we will say for the encourage-

ment of our divinity students, that, with good instruction, a man with good abilities can master the Hebrew, so as to be quite at home in it, in less than six months, provided his attention be thoroughly and exclusively devoted to it.

The proper order of these studies is, first the Greek then the Hebrew. But they may be pursued at the same time without disadvantage, or independently and at different times, as the learner may find it convenient. But it is a waste of time to attempt to gain a knowledge of these languages without access to a good teacher. Hebrew also may be studied to advantage without a previous knowledge of Greek, though a previous knowledge of both Greek and Latin is a very great help, especially in understanding the meaning of grammatical terms and the general principles of syntax. But there is no great difficulty at this point if the student has a good knowledge of English grammar. An ability to read the Hebrew is possible to all, and is certainly worth the toil of a few months, or even years. A good Hebrew grammar for students beginning the study is still a desideratum. Our writers of Hebrew grammars have aimed to write for scholars rather than for students. They have been ambitious on most points to say all that could be said, without studying to say only that which is needful to be said. Such are the grammars of Stuart, Gesenius, Nordheimer, and Green.

The poor student opens these grammars and finds in the first place a book of three, four, or five hundred pages. He finds a train of outlandish terms and often unexplained, and of queer spellings also. Why, for example, should Kamets and Kal be spelled with a Q in the place of K, as Qamets, Qal? Everything which keeps up a show of mystery and difficulty should be banished out of the grammar. It is true that some of the grammars undertake to accommodate the beginner by putting in large print the rules deemed specially important But for the most part it is done without the requisite skill. In our best Hebrew grammars the student gets bewildered, and the things he most needs to know he fails to find, especially without the aid of a skillful teacher.

The rules and principles should always be expressed in the most lucid terms, and in the most comprehensive manner consistent with perspicuity. The intricacies of the vowel changes

and the offices of the accents, except accents of emphasis and pause, may be ignored in rudimental study.

Let these principles be committed to memory, and let them be applied constantly in the translation till the student is familiar with them. Let this course be rigidly continued till the grammar is finished, and then let it be reviewed and re-reviewed *until it becomes a part of himself*, and he will soon acquire such a mastery of the language that he will soon be able to make a grammar of his own. He will readily distinguish that which is anomalous from that which is regular, and he will then read a philosophical grammar, like that of Dr. Nordheimer, with the keenest relish.

The late Prof. Stuart of Andover has left on record his reply to the above objection in the following forcible words:

> The fact is, that when men complain of *want of time* for study and a want of means, they only show that after all they are either attached to some other object of pursuit, or *have no part or lot in the spirit of a student.* They will applaud others, it may be, who do study, and look with some degree of satisfaction, or a kind of wonder, upon their acquisitions; but for themselves they cannot spare the time or expense necessary to make such acquisitions, or they put it to the account of their humility, and bless themselves that they are not *ambitious.* In most of all these cases, however, either the love of the world or genuine laziness lies at the bottom. Had they more energy and decision of character, and did they redeem the precious moments which they now lose in laboriously doing nothing, or nothing to the purpose of the Church, they might open all the treasures of the East and of the West and have them at their disposal.
>
> I might safely promise a good knowledge of Greek and Hebrew to most men of this sort, if they would diligently improve the time that they now absolutely throw away, in the course of three or four years. While one man is deliberating whether he had better study a language, another man has obtained it. . . . And what is worst of all in this temporizing class of students is, that if you reason with them and convince them that they are pursuing a wrong course, the conviction operates no longer than until the next paroxysm of indolence or of a worldly spirit comes on. These syren charmers lull every energetic power of the mind to sleep. The mistaken man who listens to their voice finds himself at the age of forty just where he was at thirty; at fifty his decline has already begun; at sixty he is universally regarded with indifference, which he usually repays with misanthropy; and if he has the misfortune to live till seventy, *everybody is uneasy because he is not transferred to a better world.*

2. It is sometimes said that *Greek and Hebrew cannot be used in the pulpit, on account of the popular prejudice.* A minister who quotes Greek and Hebrew in the pulpit is looked upon as showing himself off, and will offend and disgust the more sensible part of his hearers.

This objection is superficial, and not well taken to the extent implied. No true candidate for the ministry studies the Greek or Hebrew, or indeed any other study, for the purpose of showing himself off, but rather to see more clearly and fully the mind of the Spirit. A coxcomb or mere exquisite in the pulpit is always unsuitable, and all will admit that *he* is altogether intolerable when he begins to spout Latin, Greek, or Hebrew.

Even in the case of a man of sense and sound learning, whose weight of character will command respect, philological disquisition can be only sparingly used in the pulpit. In the case of a mere pretender it is simply ridiculous. But in the case of a truly learned and modest man it may often be used, when there is a real call for it, with the finest effect; but even he will avoid it as far as he can, and will seek to give his hearers the *true sense* of Scripture, which by the assistance of philology he has obtained, and he will state it in a perspicuous, candid way; and as he knows what he is saying, the people will perceive it, will be edified by it, and will thank God that they have such a minister, who is able to break the bones which conceal the golden marrow of the truth; or, as Jahn well expresses it, "It is not the shell of erudition but the nut of doctrine which is to be given to the people. A minister ought to be a learned man that he may break the shell and come at the nut."

It is the truly learned, modest, and pious man alone that can carry philology, or even the legitimate results of philology, into the pulpit. Sometimes it is *necessary* to quote Greek and Hebrew in the pulpit. For example, how can a minister preach on the subject of baptism, on the mode and subjects thereof, without quoting the original terms? How could a minister prove the divinity of Christ, as presented in the Scriptures, without demonstrating it from the Greek and Hebrew titles by which he is called? This at least is one of the modes by which this fundamental doctrine is to be established.

With this and like exceptions we heartily indorse the following view of Prof. Stuart:

> The interpreter should not exhibit the process of exegesis in his public discourses, but the *results* of it. This very simple and intelligible rule will save a man from the appearance of being pedantic in the pulpit, while it communicates to his hearers the benefit of all his private studies.

Perhaps we should say that Prof. Stuart needs a still further qualification. In respect to sermons or addresses delivered on set occasions before cultivated audiences, it is often allowable to illustrate a doctrine or sentiment by quotations from the original, either from the Scriptures or from the classics. This is no more than the Apostle Paul did sometimes, both in his letters and in his discourses. It was done also by the most distinguished preachers of the early Church, as Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Jerome; and by the Reformers, as Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin; and very often by John Wesley, and even by Prof. Stuart himself. In an audience where nobody understands Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, it would not seem wise to introduce them, unless from obvious necessity. It may be by so doing some bright mind in the congregation may be moved and set upon a course of study and investigation which will result in great good. There is not a congregation in the land where the young minister will not be likely to find some educated persons. He cannot impose upon them by superficial attainments. They will not fail to see the ass under the lion's skin. Unless his scholarship be thorough and genuine, he will ere long wish the itinerant wheel to move him to another place.

The ancient Father, Jerome, has well described the pretenders of his day, and the description fits so many of these times also, that I beg leave to quote it. It is found in his epistle to Paulinus:

> What belongs to medicine, physicians teach; artificers instruct in the knowledge of the arts. The art of explaining the Scriptures [however] is the only thing everybody understands. "*Scribimus indocti doctique poemeta passim.*" The garrulous old woman, the prating old man, the wordy sophist, all engage in this business. They mangle the Scriptures, and teach before they have learned. Some, with their eyebrows knit together, spout forth great swelling words, and philosophize among old women about sacred liter-

ature. Others, O shame! learn of women what they are to teach to men; and as if this were but a small matter, they descant with bold flippancy in public upon things which they do not understand. I say nothing of those who hold the same office as myself, and who, after the acquisition of a little secular knowledge, come to the Scriptures and in a set discourse soothe the ears of the populace. Whatever they utter they think is the law of God. Nor do they deign to inquire what the prophets or apostles thought, but heap together incongruous testimony to make out the meaning which they give; as if it were some great affair, and not a most vicious mode of teaching, to pervert the meaning of Scripture, and to make it speak as they wish, contrary to its true sense.

The truth is, the objection we are combating, that a knowledge of Greek and Hebrew does not afford pabulum for the pulpit, or that it ministers to the pride and love of display in the truly pious and learned preacher, is an immense mistake in either view. It may be true of Greek and Hebrew learning, as it may be of other departments of knowledge, that

> "Shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
> While drinking largely sobers us again."

This is the most that can be said; none but the superficial or the coxcomb will show himself off. We would therefore invite our young brethren to no superficial study of the originals of God's word. Let it be thorough, let it be constant. Let it be done as early as may be; always, if possible, before entering upon the full responsibilities of the pastorate. It should be done to the extent of reading the entire Scriptures. Two chapters and a psalm out of the Old Testament, and one chapter out of the New Testament daily, Sundays excepted, will suffice to accomplish this great work in a single year.

### § 9. The Preaching of Methodism highly Biblical.

We regard it as the crowning glory of Methodism, that its teaching and preaching have been pre-eminently biblical. John Wesley says, in the Preface to his Sermons:

> I design plain truth for plain people, therefore of set purpose I abstain from all nice and philosophical speculations, from all perplexed and intricate reasonings, and as far as possible from even the show of learning, unless in sometimes citing the original Scriptures. . . . I want to know one thing, the way to heaven; how to land on that happy shore. God himself has condescended to teach the way: for this very end he came from heaven. He

hath written it down in a book! O give me that book, at any price give me the book of God! I have it. Here is knowledge enough for me. Let me be *homo unius libri.* Here then I am, far from the busy ways of men. I sit down alone, only God is here. In his presence I open, I read this book, for this end, to find the way to heaven. Is there a doubt concerning the meaning of what I read? Does any thing appear dark and intricate? I lift my heart to the Father of lights. Lord, is it not thy word, "If any man lack wisdom let him ask of God?" Thou givest liberally and upbraidest not. Thou hast said, if any be willing to do thy will he shall know. I am willing to *do*, let me *know* thy will. I then search after and consider parallel passages of Scripture, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, I meditate thereon with all the attention and earnestness of which my mind is capable. If any doubt still remains I consult those who are experienced in the things of God, and then their writings whereby being dead they yet speak, and what I thus learn that I teach.

These earnest words should stir our hearts, who are Wesley's sons in the Gospel, like a voice from the other world. "*O give me that book! at any price give me the book of God! I have it. Here is knowledge enough for me! Let me be* HOMO UNIUS LIBRI." These are words worthy to be written in letters of gold! O that we all might be *men of one book*!*

Thus it was that John Wesley became "*mighty in the Scriptures.*" He was "*a man of one book.*" Pre-eminently so were many of his sons in the Gospel, as Clarke and Watson, Benson and Coke, and many others whom God is yet sparing to us, whose names will shine with increasing luster. Let us keep up the sacred succession. We should be anxious especially that our schools of the prophets should be famous for their culture of biblical study and biblical learning. We must guard ourselves, and guard one another, against the too common tendency to avoid the hard study requisite to learn two difficult languages. If it be for the divine glory and our soul's good, we ought not to, and will not, reluctate at the toil.

### § 10. BIBLICAL LEARNING NEEDFUL FOR THE MISSIONARY WORK.

It would not be proper to leave this subject without adverting to the fact that a good knowledge of the original Scriptures is necessary, *highly necessary, to our ministers who*

* This maxim, we suggest, needs some guarding against fanatical construction.—ED.

*go out on our foreign missionary work.* No young man is entitled to aspire to this highly honorable part of the Gospel work who has not or will not qualify himself for it by a thorough study of the original Scriptures.

The most responsible and important work of the missionary, in this age of the Church, is to give the word of God to the heathen in their own tongues; that every man may hear as in the apostolic times, each in his own tongue, the wondrous works of God.

In a work on "Ministerial Education," published twelve years ago, we used the following language:

> No great permanence can be anticipated in heathen converts without the written word. Like the early converts at Berea, they must be able to search the Scriptures daily to see whether these things be so. They must be braced and fortified by the written word. This of course cannot be done without reducing their languages to writing, and rendering the Scriptures into them.
>
> Hence, in order that the heathen may learn to read, arises the necessity of schools and of school books. And when organized into Churches, digests of Christian doctrine, Church formularies and discipline, hymns and psalmody for sacred worship, all become necessary. See, then, the extraordinary qualifications required of the Christian missionary. To translate the Scriptures, he must be a profound scholar in the original languages and literature, of the Bible. And to lay the foundations of a nation's literature, he must also be versed in general learning.

The great missionary boards of the Christian world are generally acting on this principle, and are sending out only men of solid attainments in biblical learning. The missionaries of the American Board have translated the Bible into more than thirty different languages; the English and American Baptists into more than forty, and the English and American Methodists into about twenty. Our own missionaries in China, India, and Bulgaria are now busy at this work. One of the last acts of the late beloved C. R. Martin, of the China mission, was the instruction of a brother missionary in the rudiments of Hebrew. The great work of rendering the Scriptures into the myriad tongues of this babbling earth has only just begun. The students of our biblical schools will have enough to do, in this most pious and heavenly work, for generations yet to come. O that we might have some adequate conception of our responsibility in this matter! Our

Churches are not yet half awake to the importance of this particular part of the missionary work. The establishment of our oldest biblical school had this matter specially in view, as will appear from the twelfth article of its by-laws: "The preparation of young men for foreign missions shall be a special object of the institution, and students contemplating the missionary work shall receive such special classification and training as the seminary may be able to afford."

Alas! though this is the nineteenth year of its existence, it has never yet been able to do more than to afford the ordinary instruction in biblical and theological learning. But we hope for better days, and that God will speedily put it into the hearts of his people to devise more liberal things for this great department of the Gospel work.

### § 11. Conclusion.

In conclusion, we would offer a few practical remarks. And first, *Is it advisable for a young man entering upon a course of biblical study, to undertake at the same time the charge of a small congregation?* Our impression is that it is altogether more than any young man ought to attempt for the first two years of biblical study. Biblical learning *is jealous, and requires the whole man*, as an old Greek said of painting. We would not say that occasional preaching is inexpedient. But to undertake a charge is, in our judgment, too much. It will certainly result in disaster to any young man's scholarship. Greek and Hebrew cannot be acquired with a divided mind. The student should not allow himself to be diverted, for one or two years at least, by any other pursuit. I repeat, without the devout use of his time and attention to this work, he will not be likely to make such attainments as will make the reading and study of Greek and Hebrew a pleasure to him. Unless the student covenants with himself that, with the help of God, this attainment *shall be made*, he will be likely to fail.

For the same reason it is inexpedient for the biblical student to try to take a course, or even a partial course, of scientific or secular study at the same time with that of divinity. He will come to the study of the Bible and its languages with a divided mind, and the result will be quite certain to be a failure. College students, therefore, and seminary students

likewise, should not attempt a divinity course till they have finished their college or seminary course.

Secondly. Nothing is so honorable, in our estimation, in a minister's library as a well worn Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament. As the body lives by material bread, so the soul must live upon the bread of the Word. Let the young minister never fail, as he eats of the bread which perishes, to eat also of that bread which endures to everlasting life. In other words, let him read and study the original Scriptures daily. Let him not fail thus to feed his soul with the word of God and prayer, as often and as diligently as he feeds his body. Let him read at least one chapter out of the Old Testament, and another out of the New, critically, thoroughly, and with prayer, every day Sundays excepted. Let him not allow the shameful dust to gather upon the lids of an unused Bible, which will by and by be a swift witness against him both in this world and in the world to come.

Thirdly. After a good facility is attained in the reading of Hebrew, the student can proceed at once to the study of Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Rabbinic, Samaritan, Persic, and Ethiopic, if he chooses to go so far. Hebrew lies at the foundation of all these languages. Its radices are found in them all, and they are derived from it, in the same manner as the Italian, the Spanish, the German, the French, and English are derived from the Latin and Greek.

An ability to read Chaldee, Arabic, Syriac, and Rabbinic, is a great help to the critical study of the Hebrew. The treasures of oriental learning are contained in these languages; and Hebrew words, the literal meaning of which is lost, and the traditional meaning of which is obscure, and those of rare occurrence, are often presented in the more modern dialects, and hence their meaning, which would otherwise be doubtful, receives illustration from the cognate usage.

There is also a great mass of valuable knowledge of Scripture deposited in the Targums, the Talmuds, and the commentaries of the Rabbins. But it is the work of a lifetime to plow through these vast and unfrequented fields. Time, and health, and genius for this kind of study, as well as large pecuniary means for the purchase of books, are essential to the prosecution of these studies.

Our present life is too short, and the Gospel work too im-

portant, to allow the ordinary ministry to indulge to any great extent in roaming these fields of learning. After we have gathered enough from them to clear up those Scriptures which are in doubt, we may cast them aside, and return to the Bible itself as its own best interpreter.

Fourthly. If the general views expressed above be correct, then it follows that a true system of homiletics must always have its foundation laid in biblical hermeneutics. The Bible must be the foundation and substratum of all Christian preaching. Metaphysical or natural philosophy, except by way of illustration or inference, as either may naturally and legitimately grow out of the preacher's text or context, has no place in the pulpit. Let these be left with the professor's chair in the scientific and secular school, or the lecturer's desk.

The great work of the Christian minister is the cure of souls; all matters strictly secular, as a minister, he has nothing to do with. As a citizen, in these matters he may have an interest; but he should use his rights as a secular citizen sparingly. He is doing a great work and he cannot come down to matters merely worldly. In all concerns of social morals, and even of political morals, he has a right to enter, and often is in duty bound to do so, because his Bible carries him there. Like the prophet Jeremiah, he is set by the appointment of God "over the nations and over the kingdoms to root out and to pull down, to build and to plant."

The minister is divinely appointed to make unremitted applications of the divine law to men both in public life and in private life. In the pulpit he is upon his throne, and with his Bible before him he is the vicar of his Lord. He is in such position a judge among the people and a ruler over the nations. He is not to be afraid of the faces of men, but with intrepidity he is to declare the whole counsel of God. And then he has the more pleasing and glorious work of leading the poor sinner to "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world;" and more than that, of rooting him and grounding him in the faith, and of building him up in the hopes and triumphs of everlasting life; and more still, the divine afflatus, the living inspiration, the holy triumph, which his own soul gathers as he reads the prophets, as Isaiah, Daniel, Zachariah, and the Apocalypse, he

breathes from Sabbath to Sabbath upon his people. They catch the living stream from the lips of the pastor, and are filled with like holy emotions, and soul triumphs, and anticipated victories over the world, the flesh, and the devil, until at last, with Christ their living head, actual conquerors, they stand on Mount Zion with the long line of saints and prophets who before have reached the blissful shores.

The young minister need not fear that in this grand and wondrous field of thought and labor there will not be room enough for the expansion of his genius and the use of his powers. When he looks around upon a world lying in sin, and then upon his own impotence, he will cry out with the apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

Fifthly. Such a study of the Scriptures would tend to break down the walls of partition by which the Churches of Christ are so much divided. The Churchman and the Dissenter, the Calvinist and the Arminian, the Quaker and the Baptist, all alike receive the Bible as the book of God, and make it their common standard of appeal for the settlement of doctrine and practice. Now the science of hermeneutics prescribes rules for the interpretation of the Scriptures, founded on the common sense and reason of all men, and independent of all party and local views; and just so far as they produce their proper influence they bring men to unite in their views of the meaning of Scripture. "In fact, I know of no means so powerful," says Prof. Stuart, "or at least which promises so much in regard to the removing of opinion among Christians, as such a common law, which is independent of all parties, and a tribunal to which all must appeal, unless it be the spirit of benevolence and kindness."

We can plainly see that for the last thirty years the altitude of these partition walls has steadily been diminishing. The pastors and the sheep now pass over them with very slight difficulty. A free interchange of pulpits is becoming more and more common. The watchmen are beginning to see eye to eye, Judah is ceasing to vex Ephraim and Ephraim to envy Judah. The truth is, the more our Calvinistic brethren have studied the Bible the less of Calvin's *horribile decretum* they have found in it; and finally, very many of them have found that *it is not there at all.* This happy state of things has

come mainly from a more careful study of the divine word, as seen in the cases of those princes in biblical learning, Moses Stuart, Edward Robinson, and Albert Barnes. Their teachings, and the teachings of their many disciples, have had a happy influence upon the Christianity of our times.

Sixthly. This leads us to say that the Bible is a book for the people. It is to be taught diligently to our children. The command to search the Scriptures applies to all classes. Its momentous truths concern every responsible soul. Hence it is easy to be understood, and yet not so easy as not to require much labor and toil. This was to be expected. Labor is Heaven's first law. Two languages *must be learned.* And ten or twelve more would greatly help in the work of exposition. In addition to this, one should be well versed in Jewish and classical antiquities, including chronology, sacred geography, civil and Church history. "Yet even this is but preliminary," says Dr. M'Lelland. "Now comes the actual tug: the reading verse after verse with the accurate settling of every philological question that arises, by the aid of the dictionary and grammar; the examining of scope, context, parallelism, idiom, and typical diction; the comparing of our own results with those of some judicious commentator, and the careful gathering up of the great truths, whether doctrinal or practical, contained in every paragraph—these are the gymnastics by which the young Christian athlete learns to endure hardness, and becomes a skillful and gallant soldier in the service of his Master."

After all that has been said, I am well aware that many an indolent, ease-loving student will say, It is a hard saying—so much work—who can receive it? It is too much, for me, I must be satisfied with King James. And some who may start on the road to this Canaan will soon be, like Israel in the desert, looking back to Egypt. We have been in the habit of lauding the English version too much. The simple truth is, that in comparison with other versions it stands high. It is a noble monument of "*English pure and undefiled.* But after all it is an exceedingly imperfect representation of the original."* The scholarship of the venerable men who formed it was necessarily very imperfect, since great light has been

* M'Lelland on Interpretation.

thrown both upon Greek and Hebrew for the last three hundred years. Confessedly a much better translation could now be made. But no translation can be perfect.

I would illustrate what I mean by a few examples taken from the first chapter of Genesis. This chapter is probably as well rendered as any other in the Bible, and yet any one can see, from the examples I shall give, how imperfect it is.

In verse 1 the verb בָּרָא is rendered simply "created," whereas the word here means created out of nothing. The creation was not out of pre-existing materials. This is clear from the third verse of the second chapter, where it is said "the *Lord rested* from all his work which *he created and made;*" that is, he first *created*, then *fashioned, formed*, which idea is expressed by the verb עָשׂוֹת. If the verb בָּרָא meant merely to *form* or *fashion*, then it would have been simple tautology to have used also the verb עָשָׂה in the same sense.

We advance to verse 2: "And the earth was" תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ. Our version renders "without form and void," which does not convey the full idea. It was "void." Void of what? Can any merely English reader tell? He is silent. Let us look at the Hebrew. תֹּהוּ, תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ, probably from הָמָה, *tumult, confusion.* תֹּהוּ, chaotic, atoms thrown together without order. תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ, a *shapeless, chaotic mass.* Jeremiah uses the phrase (iv, 23,) of Judea devastated by its enemies, leaving the land *devastated* and *ruined*, תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ.

Now we have a more striking failure in the next clause, "And the Spirit of God *moved* upon the face of the waters." וְרוּחַ, rendered "moved," is a Piel participle from רָחַף, which in Piel means to *brood over, hover over*, as a hen over her chickens, or a bird over her young. Compare Deut. xxxii, 11, "As an eagle stirreth up her nest, *fluttereth over* her young." וְרִחֵף, rather broods over them by way of *warming* and *nourishing* them.

Thus we might go on from verse to verse and from word to word, and constantly find instances in which our version fails fully to represent the original, from the first verse in Genesis to the last verse in the Apocalypse. It would, in fact, require many volumes to make the more important corrections, and yet thousands of indolent students and ministers will say, "Never mind the Greek and the Hebrew. If you get the

English that will do." And so the young man stands up in our pulpits shorn of all independence in interpretation, all his life trying to tread in some other man's tracks, in so far a mere plagiarist, stealing the interpretations of other men, and retailing them out to our congregations. Well may such a young man say, in the language of Wesley, "Ought not shame to cover my face?"

We would, if possible, be heard by the three hundred young brethren who in this year of our Lord 1866, will knock at the doors of our Annual Conferences for admission as probationers. Probably not more than one in ten of these men are good Greek and Hebrew scholars. Ought not a large proportion of the remaining nine tenths to hasten to one of our biblical schools? Here Greek and Hebrew can be obtained without money and without price. We mourn for their prospects if foolishly they rush into this war with only a small part of their armor. The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, they have not the requisite skill to handle. The enemies of God and truth triumph, and the Church is weak and feeble because her leaders are weak.

Allow us, then, still to insist that there is no other way—no other royal road into this kingdom, than that of labor and toil in disinterring thousands of Greek and Hebrew roots, in analyzing legions of Greek and Hebrew idioms, and in poring over Latin, Greek, and oriental antiquities. *It must be done.* God by a miracle gave to the disciples on the day of Pentecost the gift of tongues. But the day of miracles has passed away, and all deficiencies must now be made up by our *persistent* labor. It depends entirely upon ourselves under God.

Our people are quite tired of those old texts and sermons. They want something new out of the treasures of the Word; fresh pastures, new pabulum, and these must come to the hungry sheep from the pulpit, *through the preacher.* In order to give this pabulum *we must study the Scriptures;* we must climb high up into its sacred mountains of vision; we must become the companions of the symbolical prophets; we must converse often with Daniel and Zechariah, and with John look upon the mighty wonders of the Apocalypse. Be not afraid, "Behold I set before you an open door!" "Come in!" Sit down with Moses and the prophets, with Christ and his apostles.

Then when we come before our people we will not come with some old skeleton from Fish, or Simeon, or Watson, or Wesley, with flesh ill put on. We will come with our own invigorated spirit; having drunk from the crystal fountains, "which flow fast by the oracle of God," we will come with a full heart and a ready utterance, and will bring new things out of our treasures as well as old.

Systems and works of human devising, as commentaries and bodies of divinity, are of secondary importance. As such we will view them. The Bible alone will be the substance of our preaching. An undying love for the Holy Scriptures will seize our souls; we will sit right down by these divine fountains as they issue from the heavenly throne. There we will dwell—thence we will draw for our own souls and for the souls of our people. "Blessed is that servant who when the Master comes shall be found so doing."

---

## Art. IV.—REMINISCENCES OF REV. HENRY BOEHM.

*Reminiscences, Historical and Biographical, of Sixty-four Years in the Ministry.* By Rev. Henry Boehm, Bishop Asbury's Traveling Companion, and Executor of his Last Will and Testament. Edited by Rev. Joseph B. Wakeley. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1865.

The resources of the American people seem only to be in the commencement of their sublime development. We are told by a writer* of more than national celebrity, that intelligence is the only guiding force that is able to sway this nation. We have differences of climate and of scenery and a large immigration. What force is to mould these diverse elements, to transform American life into a still higher type? What is to make us one great, free, and happy nation? The reply is, science, art, intercommunication, the steam car and the steam press—one language, one idea of liberty and humanity. The above writer deals mostly with the principles of science. We hail this light, and receive with grateful acknowledgment what-

* "Thoughts on the Future Civil Policy of America, by John William Draper, M.D., LL.D."

ever it reveals to us of the good and the true. We accept that *the clergy* should meet scientific men with candid reasoning and avail themselves of the aid science offers. We even take the admissions of the same writer with reference to the value of the moral and religious idea represented by the Bible, as an offset to what may appear contradictory in his own statement elsewhere. Intelligence is mighty. Let us have discussion. Let us have discovery and invention. Let us have light. But is this all? Is the public a great idol and the individual soul a cypher?

Let us take up another volume, a record of facts: the history of the life and labors of an itinerant preacher. What do we learn from this? Simply that another set of forces have been operating in the world, and producing effects which are to-day seen and going on to multiply their activity. We are told force, in the physical world, is immortal. Whether this be so or not, it certainly is in the moral world. Results begun here reach eternity. The early Methodist preachers have helped to make this nation what it is. And they are only a part of the great, all-pervading religious element. Under the ministry of this one Church is a grand aggregate in the United States and Canada of 8,000,000 of people. The *religious idea* is not "a failure," but is destined to renovate and rule the world. Society exists for the welfare of the individual.

Henry Boehm has contributed unconsciously, in the simple annals of his life, one of the strongest arguments in favor of the divine power and efficacy of Chistianity. His experience and lifetime extended over the greater part of a century. He thus defines his chronological relation to the stirring events of our American history:

I was born in the old homestead in the township of Conestoga, Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, on the 8th of June, 1775. This was immediately after the battle of Lexington, and one year before the Declaration of Independence. Thus I saw the birth of our nation, and have lived under the first President, George Washington, and sixteen of his successors, to Andrew Johnson. I was born nine years before the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, and have known all its bishops, from Thomas Coke, the first, to Calvin Kingsley, the last elected. My memory goes back over eighty years. I recollect when they traveled out west to Fort Pitt, now Pittsburgh, on pack-horses! The roads, if we may call them roads, for they were mere paths through the wilderness, were

so rough that they could not be traveled any other way. The old school-house, and my schoolmaster, Henry Rosman, I well remember. He came from Hesse-Cassel, and was one of the Hessian soldiers taken prisoners at Trenton, New Jersey, when Washington and his noble band crossed the frozen Delaware and surprised Colonel Ralle and his troops, and took them prisoners, while their commander was slain. Some of the German hymns which he taught me to sing, over eighty years ago, I still remember well. To him I am indebted for my accurate knowledge of the German language, which I learned before the English. In after years it was a great benefit to me when I preached in German. I was one of the first among the Methodists that preached in that language. This I have done in fourteen different states.—Pp. 13, 14.

Thus we see the future companion of Asbury trained by an acquaintance with the language of Martin Luther as well as with the English, and most of all by a pious home teaching, for a career of unpretending but extensive usefulness. But let us see what was his early training at home. That great man of the nation, Abraham Lincoln, said, "All that I am or hope to be I owe to my angel mother." A pious parentage, though not requisite to salvation, is important. The father of Henry Boehm was descended from the pious Mennonites, who came from the land of the Rhine that they might enjoy undisturbed their religious freedom. He found himself at length a preacher of the United Brethren, and with the great Otterbein, the intimate friend of Bishop Asbury, was one of the founders of that Society. At the time of his death he was connected with the Methodist Church. Indeed there was constant communion and interchange of pulpit labor at that day between the Methodists and the United Brethren, and there was strong talk of uniting the two bodies in one. Mr. Boehm thus speaks of his early religious opportunities:

My early advantages for religious instruction were great. I was "brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Morning and evening the old family Bible was read and prayer was offered. My Father's voice still echoes in my ears. My mother, too, had much to do in moulding my character and shaping my destiny. One evening as I returned home I heard a familiar voice engaged in prayer. I listened. It was my mother. Among other things she prayed for her children, and mentioned Henry, her youngest son. The mention of my name broke my heart, and melted me into contrition. Tears rolled down my cheeks, and I felt the importance of complying with the command of God, "My son, give me thine heart."—P. 16.

In his eighteenth year, through the instrumentality of his pious father, he was rescued from the wicked company into which he had fallen, and was brought to God.

Among the early pioneers of Methodism who visited his father's house, Mr. Boehm mentions Benjamin Abbott. Along the path of this wonderful man everywhere were displayed the tokens of divine power. The impenitent fell like dead men, and were restored to strength and consciousness, shouting and praising God. The work swept on like an irresistible tornado. Mr. Boehm the older said, "I never saw God work in this way before." The meetings were sometimes held through the whole night, for the people seemed unwilling to disperse. Henry Boehm says:

> It was more like Pentecost than anything else I ever saw. The influence of that meeting was tremendous, and for years it made a great deal of talk in my father's neighborhood.—P. 24.

In 1801 Henry Boehm was admitted into full connection in the traveling ministry and ordained. He dates from the same year as Dr. Bangs and Bishop Hedding. He also has interesting reminiscences of Robert Strawbridge. He says:

> I heard Strawbridge preach at my father's house in 1781, and am the only man now living that has a personal recollection of him. Though I was then quite small, his image is still before me. He was a stout, heavy man, and looked as if he was built for service. My father was much pleased with him and his preaching. He was agreeable company, full of interesting anecdotes. Many times I have been to the old log meeting-house he erected in Maryland, concerning which so much has been said and written, and around which so many interests cluster. He died in August of the same year I heard him; and his spiritual son, Richard Owings, preached his funeral sermon, from Revelation xiv, 13. No monument marks the place where his dust is sleeping.—P. 20.

May we not hope that before the centenary of Methodism shall pass, this spot will be properly commemorated? It is not often history calls upon the stand a more important witness than Henry Boehm. He speaks mostly from personal knowledge. His observation extends over a period which is reckoned with the venerable past, and, without disparagement of the present, has been called the heroic age of the Church. The witness tells his story without embellishment or exaggeration. The most pleasing conviction of those who peruse his

testimony as given in this book is, that the reader gets the simple facts and can rely upon them. The writer of this article well remembers spending many delightful hours in the society of this aged minister of Christ, in 1861. When not engaged in conversation, our venerable friend is intensely employed in perusing the Bible, of the meaning of which he seems to have a most excellent understanding. It was while the writer was stationed at Rhinebeck, a spot sacred to Methodism, and where now sleep the remains of Garrettson, that he saw "Father Boehm," as he is commonly called, and heard him preach. The Church has reason to rejoice that Providence has spared so interesting a representative of her early founders to see the centenary year, and afford us at least one link by which we may connect the present with the glorious past.

The supervising hand of Rev. Joseph B. Wakeley, who has given such valuable contributions to our denominational literature in his "Lost Chapters," "Heroes of Methodism," etc., has afforded that aid in perfecting this volume which the advanced age of its venerable author required. Certainly we have cause to receive with gratitude the result. We do not propose to give to the reader this book in detached portions, for the greater pleasure is to be derived from the perusal of the volume itself. We do not assume even to give all the most important facts that bear on the present interests of the Church, but we will attempt, briefly, and as we can in such an article, to mark the salient points around which the principal facts may be grouped.

I. Perhaps the first great peculiarity to be observed is the Christian propagandism to which the Methodist Church owes so much of its power.

The itinerancy, whatever may be its disadvantages, as recently set forth by a writer in the pages of this Review, undoubtedly has this advantage: that it reaches the greatest number of people in a sparsely-settled country with its message. It is no disparagement of this system that Satan himself has employed it. "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord and

said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." Job i, 6, 7. The same activity must be employed by the servants of Christ in working out good as the devil employs in working evil. The early Methodist preachers were stationed on horseback. This was, in their day, the swiftest mode of traveling. It is true the itinerancy must not be confined to this one mode. In some cases it must call in the aid of steam, and travel thousands of miles where it formerly did one. The apostles were itinerants. Paul was greatly instrumental in diffusing Christianity by this means. Christianity is light in motion, not a fixed but a revolving sun which "*arises*" "with healing in its wings." The early Methodist preachers had a diffusive literature which they carried in their saddle-bags to the cabins and log houses of the wilderness. The indefatigable Robert Williams scattered everywhere the first American tracts, consisting of Mr. Wesley's Sermons in pamphlet form. Henry Boehm also circulated the Methodist Discipline and tracts in German. Our hymns too, thus spread, raised the devotional ardor of the people. The preachers themselves were often flying couriers, bearing the glad tidings of revivals from Georgia to Canada. These travels were not without toil and hardship. Bishop Asbury, feeble in body but blessed in mind, as he turned his face to cross the Alleghanies on one of his great western tours, thus says: "Although much afflicted, I felt wholly given up to do or suffer the will of God; to be sick or well, and to live or die, at any time and in any place—the fields, the woods, the house, or the wilderness; glory be to God for such resignation! I have but little to leave except a journey of five thousand miles a year, the care of more than a hundred thousand souls, and the arrangement of about four hundred preachers yearly, to which I may add the murmurs and discontent of ministers and people. Who wants this legacy? Those who do are welcome to it for me."—P. 103. So we see that in the good old times human nature was much the same as now, and under the plan by which such glorious results have been accomplished there was occasionally friction from "the murmurs and discontent of" both "ministers and people."

But the real commission of the itinerant is in the words of Christ, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to

every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." It was the Gospel preached under these awful sanctions that wrought such wonders. It was said by one of the hearers of Whitefield, "He preached like a lion." The "woe is me" drove on the herald, and the view of impending doom threatening the guilty soul gave strength to his warning cry; free grace and the Spirit's power proclaimed the swiftly conquering steps of Him who is "mighty to save;" the constraining love of Christ pictured him expiring on the cross for a lost world, while a spirit-voice whispered from that agonizing scene, as it did to Benjamin Abbott, in words of hope, "I died for you." Then, too, chimed in the soul-ravishing doctrines of the "perfect love" of God, and the dying testimonies of saints so clear and oft-repeated as to lead Mr. Wesley to say, "Our people die well."

May we not then suppose that a system starting from such a commission, and embracing such principles, is not *transitory* but destined to endure; for Jesus said, "and lo, I am with you alway even to the end of the world."

But before we leave this part of the subject let this fact be noted: the true itinerancy does not consist in mere *change*, but in *regular, systematic* change, accomplished according to that law which is guided by the signs of providence, and is the harmony of the world. In this sense the itinerancy is the latest, purest, highest type of the New Testament evangelism.

To change fitfully is not itinerancy; neither is it itinerancy to interfere with the law for some temporal consideration, or to anticipate too long beforehand the decision of the executive officer who gives expression to the law. For providential reasons often arise in a month, or even in a day, to change the direction of the decision of the appointing power. The action of stations or circuits and their committees to secure a pastor should be cautious, reverent, and sincere. Above all, "let every soul be subject unto the higher powers."

An important element of spiritual aggression and power is lay preaching. The local preachers and exhorters do much good, and fill an important place under the Methodist economy. The truth of this statement will at once be perceived when we consider that Methodism was planted on this western con-

tinent by local preachers. Philip Embury commenced preaching in New York before the Revolution, and helped to build the first chapel in John-street. About the same time Robert Strawbridge, from Ireland, commenced preaching near Sam's Creek, in Maryland, extended his labors to Baltimore, and was successful in building up in those regions a flourishing Church. Capt. Webb, a local preacher from England, shortly after came to New York, and greatly encouraged the struggling Church, and extended his journeys into distant cities and states. Without these labors of our faithful local preachers, Methodism in many places to-day would undoubtedly have been far weaker than it is, or perhaps have never existed at all. The real spirit of lay preaching pervades our whole economy. Our class-leaders are all exhorters in their sphere, and our people, male and female, are taught in our class and prayer meetings to be witnesses for Christ.

All this is perfectly agreeable to our Church polity and doctrines, for we are trammeled with no dogmas of High-Church priestly succession. The love-feasts of the Methodists, (revived from the ancient Church,) and our quarterly meetings, have been centers of sympathy and of social and spiritual power. Henry Boehm tells us of Gov. Bassett and his amiable wife going forty miles to meet Bishop Asbury and attend quarterly meeting. Such journeys, and even for a greater distance, were frequent.

Another source of power over the masses which Methodism possessed, and which caused its more rapid spread, was its singing. Charles Wesley gave soaring wings to its hymnology. The devotional fervor of his wondrous hymns bore the believer toward heaven, and charmed the sinner away from the vanities of the world. One who well knew* has thus described the singing of the former times:

> The old singing was not always harmonious, scarcely ever artistic; but it was more generally devotional, sympathetic, melting. It was a moral force sometimes overwhelming. Of old, masses would be sung down and then sung up again. Sinners would be sung into tears, and the penitent's prayer, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and then sung into shouting, "Glory to God in the highest." There was converting, and sanctifying

* George Peck, D.D., in his Semi-Centennial Sermon before the Oneida and Wyoming Conferences.

power in the old singing. It was the singing for the times, and was full of God. No tune book nor particular style of music will bring back the glorious old singing. The old Methodists sung as Mr. Wesley advises, "lustily, and with a good courage."

In old Middlefield, when a boy, I stood upon a hill on my father's place and heard the singing of the prayer-meeting on another hill more than a mile across a deep dell. The old chorus,

> "Glory, honor, praise, and power
> Be unto the Lamb forever;
> Jesus Christ is my Redeemer;
> Halleluiah, praise the Lord!"

came across the valley, particularly the "Halleluiah, praise the Lord!" like what shall I say? Like distant thunder? Like the roaring of the ocean? More like the shout of a victorious army, but not exactly like that. Indeed, not like anything earthly. Like itself and nothing else. I would that I could hear it again, but I never shall in this world. Ah! I hope to hear those stentorian voices sing "Halleluiah" before the throne.—P. 16.

And what was the result of these spiritual forces thus brought to bear upon the people? Revivals, mighty, glorious, and overwhelming revivals of religion, burst out and spread in every direction. The camp-meeting, the conference, the quarterly meeting, the social prayer-meeting, and the class were frequently the occasion of the conversion and sanctification of multitudes of souls. Indeed, this was the rule, and the barren or unfruitful meeting was the sad and mournful exception. One thing particularly we are impressed with in these jottings of our venerable author, and that is, the frequency of revivals at conferences. Perhaps Methodist preachers have more business now to transact at our conferences than formerly, but it may be doubted whether we pray enough, or preach enough, at such times, with direct reference to the salvation of souls. But let us refer directly to our author. We are thus by him assured of the early date of the practice of inviting mourners to the altar:

During the revivals on the peninsula in 1801 and the two following years, as well as at the camp-meeting in 1805, it was the invariable practice to invite mourners to come forward. The Rev. Richard Sneath . . . has thrown light on this subject. In a letter to Dr. Coke, dated Milford, October 5, 1802, he says: "On January 25th 1801, at St. George's, Philadelphia, after Mr. Cooper had been preaching, I invited all the mourners to come to the communion-table that we might pray particularly for them. This I found to

be useful, as it removed that shame which often hinders souls from coming to Christ, and excited them to the exercise of faith. About thirty professed to be converted, and twenty-six joined the Society." Mr. Sneath says, also, "In 1800 and 1801 I added, on Milford circuit, upward of three thousand members."—P. 136.

The following is descriptive of a quarterly meeting held on Dover circuit. The meeting was held in a grove.

Dr. Chandler preached the opening sermon from Habbakkuk iii, 2: "O Lord, revive thy work," etc. Great success attended the word. Brother Richard Lyon exhorted. I closed with prayer, and then Brother Lyon invited the mourners to the front of the preachers' stand. I preached in the afternoon from 1st Peter iii, 9; and at night James Bateman, from Acts iii, 19, on the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. We had not only the gentle dew, but the refreshing shower; a number of mourners came to the altar; sinners were pricked to the heart, and some who came to mock remained to pray. During the meeting one hundred and sixty were converted, and thirty-four professed to be sanctified, and were witnesses that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. I do not wish to make any invidious comparisons, and all my brethren know that I never belonged to the family of croakers, but I will ask this qustion: What would we think if we could witness such a scene at a modern quarterly meeting? There was a power among the fathers, both in the ministry and laity, that we do not possess. The ministers moved the masses as the wind does a field of wheat, and they mowed them down as the scythe does the grass.

The above, as worthy of reflection, and as showing at least the opinion of our author, we let pass, for the present, without comment.

A camp-meeting had begun near Dover. That "old warrior, John Chalmers, opened the campaign from 'Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward.'"

The work of revival commenced in a powerful manner under the first sermon, and continued through the night. There were sixty-eight converted and twenty-nine sanctified. . . . Sabbath was a high day in Zion. . . . One hundred and ninety-eight were converted, and one hundred and sixty sanctified, Halleluiah! This was during the day. The work continued all night, and one hundred and twenty-seven were converted, and one hundred sanctified before the sun rose in the east. On Monday —— I preached at night from Luke xiv, 22, 23, "And yet there is room." The work went on gloriously all night. During the meeting there were reported one thousand three hundred and twenty conversions, and nine hundred and sixteen sanctifications.

This is wonderful. I give the figures just as I wrote them in

my journal in July 1806. Shall these eyes, before they are closed in death, ever witness such scenes again? Shall these ears ever hear such cries of distress, such shouts of joy, such songs of victory? Shall this aged heart ever feel such shocks of divine power as I felt on that consecrated ground?

Of another camp-meeting which was in Virginia he says:

On Thursday morning our camp-meeting commenced, and the work of God broke out in the several tents before a single sermon was preached. The work went on nearly all night, and the next morning they reported one hundred and twenty-two converted, and eighty-four sanctified. . . . The number of conversions reported in the course of the meeting was over nine hundred.

Mr. Boehm shortly after says, "I went to our quarterly meeting, not far from Snow Hill." (The reader will please bear in mind this was also a grove meeting.) "There were sixty souls converted, and fifty sanctified during the meeting. My soul, praise the Lord! I have dwelt here to show the reader what kind of times we had at our quarterly meetings in those days. I returned to my circuit, and there was one general revival."

Mr. Boehm speaks also of revivals at the conferences. "1808. The Philadelphia Conference met this year in the City of Brotherly Love, on March 20th. It was like one great love-feast from beginning to end. The preaching was of a high order, and many were converted."

The General Conference began the 1st of May in Baltimore. "During the session of the conference there was much eloquent and powerful preaching. On Sunday the 8th George Pickering preached in the market-house, and three preachers exhorted after him, Joseph Totten, Francis Ward, and S. Budd. There was a mighty shaking among the people. This was early in the morning. At half past ten I heard William M'Kendree from, 'Is there no balm in Gilead?' This was the eloquent sermon that made him bishop." The General Conference of 1808 was almost one continuous revival. At one time during the Virginia Conference a revival broke out among the spectators in the gallery. Such were the scenes of the Methodist olden time. And yet, in view of the revival power of 1866, we cannot say that the Church or the preachers are without the Spirit of God, and the power that carries with it revivals. Our aged Brother Boehm sees and acknowledges the

good there is in the Church now. There may be a few who doubt the present progress. To such we submit the following from the source already quoted:*

> The carping about the old-fashioned circuits and districts, and the old-fashioned preachers, in disparagement of the labor of our charges of the present day, and of the character of the preachers of these times, is not old-fashioned Methodism, but old-fashioned nonsense. Doting old people often say, "Young people are good for nothing nowadays. Just think what we had to endure in old times! Why what I passed through would kill a dozen of the young fry!" To all this it may be answered, Look at what our brave fellows have passed through in the war for the restoration of the Union! Look at what women, and even young girls, have dared and suffered, and abate your folly. Be ashamed of ever having dreamed that the race is degenerating.

Doubtless much can be said on both sides of the question, of the comparative merits of ancient and modern Methodism, but with all the facts before us from this suggestive book, and from other sources, must we not infer that revivals were certainly more frequent then than now, and may we not, while holding fast to other advantages, approach nearer to, or even surpass, the spiritual power of the fathers? We leave the reader to follow Henry Boehm (who after 1811 becomes the traveling companion of Bishop Asbury) across the Alleghanies and back, and from New England to Georgia, on his toilsome some journeys through the wilderness.

II. Another fact we observe in this book is the growth of episcopal power on this continent. At first Bishop Asbury was sent out by Mr. Wesley as a circuit preacher. Wesley sent the first regular traveling preachers as missionaries to America. They were volunteers, yet *sent*. American Methodism is the offspring of missions. The authority to appoint must reside somewhere, and we believe, according to the New Testament order, in the ministry itself, which appoints its own bishops. The fountain-head of Church authority is Christ. We learn that the appointments were well prepared beforehand by the bishop, but very silently. The character and ability of each preacher was marked and known, and oftentimes changes were effected in favor of the health and higher usefulness of the preachers then as now. Influential laymen

* Dr. G. Peck: Semi-Centennial Sermon.

were sometimes closeted with the bishop then as now, but very briefly, I imagine; and the bishop, at the close of conference, hurried away, leaving for the most part a band of heroes, hopeful, earnest, believing, prepared to do and dare, and some heavy hearts, then as now.

Could any man envy Bishop Asbury his laborious office, unless for his apostolic reward: his five thousand miles of travel on horseback, his long fastings, hard beds, exposure to heat and cold, swollen rivers, swamps, and mountains? His power grew with the growing work of God, and was providential. Let us study the picture here given of our great bishop: "Bishop Asbury had great administrative ability. He was wise and far-seeing, and kept his work planned and mapped out beforehand. The mass of the appointments were arranged before conference, so that but few changes needed to be made. He often talked to me freely about the appointments of the preachers, and sometimes consulted me. I used to transcribe them for him before they were read out. The preachers tormented me to know where they were going, but I was silent, for secret things belonged to the bishop, revealed things to the preachers. . . . The bishop not only read men for the sake of the Church, but for their own sakes. He would say to me, 'Henry, Brother A. or B. has been too long in the rice plantation or on the peninsula; he looks pale; health begins to decline; he must go up to the highlands.' The preacher would be removed and know not the cause, and the next year come to conference with health improved, and constitution invigorated, and not know to whom he was indebted for the change; for the bishop assigned few reasons, and made but few explanations for his conduct."

Of the bishop's ability in the pulpit Mr. Boehm says:

It has been supposed that he was an inferior preacher though superior as a governor. But this is a mistake. I have heard him over fifteen hundred times. His sermons were scripturally rich. He was a well-instructed scribe, "bringing out of his treasury things new and old." He was a good expounder of the word of God, giving the meaning of the writer, the mind of the Spirit. He was wise in his selection of texts. There was a rich variety in his sermons; no tedious sameness, no repeating old stale truths. He could be a son of thunder or a son of consolation. There was variety both in matter and manner. He was great at camp-meetings, on funeral occasions, and at ordinations. I have heard

him preach fifty ordination sermons, and they were among the most impressive I have ever heard.—P. 440.

Rev. J. B. Wakeley, in "Heroes of Methodism," quoting Rev. Henry Boehm, says of Asbury, "His sermons were grave, clear, and deep."

The episcopal office has changed, but the ancient laboriousness, missionary zeal, and extensive travel remain. Let us take one more view of the good bishop as he travels with M'Kendree in 1808:

My flesh sinks under labor. We are riding in a poor thirty dollar chaise, in partnership, two bishops of us; but it must be confessed it tallies well with the weight of our purse. What bishops! Well, but we have great views, and we have great times, and the Western, Southern, and Virginia Conferences will have one thousand souls truly converted to God, and is this not an equivalent for a light purse? And are we not well paid for starving and for toil? Yes, glory to God!—P. 218.

This in 1808; while in 1865, in the space of a few months, Bishop Thomson visits India, China, Egypt, Judea, Bulgaria, Italy, the northern Mississippi, New Orleans, Texas, and Oregon. How the vision enlarges and the work expands with time!

III. The next point we have to mention is Church organization. And here we meet first the Methodist class. The class-meeting is Christianity crystalizing. The perfect formation is the Church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. We are carried back to the primitive apostolic times, when the Church was embraced in families and met in private houses. Then all was simplicity, unity, and love. If the itinerancy is calculated to build up the Church outwardly, the class-meeting promotes inward growth. It makes the Church an organism, a growing tree of life, and not a mere machine. If I take in my hand a watch I have a piece of *mechanism* that is perfect, or can only be improved by art; but if I take in my hand a flower, I hold a living thing expanded by the principle of life from the germ in the seed. So the Church. The Methodist Societies in America at first had no sacraments, but were dependent upon the Protestant Episcopal Church for them. Strawbridge contended for the right to give the sacraments to the people. Bishop Asbury opposed for a long time that step, but at length yielded. The Methodist Episcopal

Church was at length fully organized, and with the consent of Wesley and Asbury proceeded on its way with all the instrumentalities of usefulness at its command. Perhaps it is well that Asbury was cautious at the first not to overstep Church order. His prudent, careful course has formed a strong and steady Church.

Mr. Wesley, after reading Lord King's account of the Primitive Church, was convinced that there are but two orders in the ministry, elders and deacons. And may we not indeed say there is but one true apostolic order, that of elder or bishop. There may be an elder appointed by consent of his brethren to oversee the Church in general, but that is only *an office, not a separate order.*

Then the providential growth of the class, the germ having been perhaps transferred from the Moravian Societies, produced one simple and harmonious whole, a Christian Church, beautiful in its proportions, admirable in working, and a reproduction of the Church of the apostles.

IV. Let us consider as next in order the General Conference. This, too, has been a providential growth. At first all the preachers met in one conference, and even that was small. Then separate conferences were required to accommodate distant localities. The first Methodist Conference in America was held in July, 1773. From this beginning has grown up the Delegated General Conference. The powers of this body are defined in our Discipline. It has no power to change our Articles of Religion, or do away with our itinerant general superintendency. "On Friday, May 1st, 1812, in the city of New York, there was a great gathering in Wesley Chapel, John-street. The cradle of American Methodism was an appropriate place in which to hold the first Delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Bishops Asbury and M'Kendree were there, and ninety representatives from eight Annual Conferences." A general council of the Church had been proposed by some of the early Reformers, the council to be composed of the bishops and presiding elders; but our fathers wisely substituted for this arrangement a Delegated General Conference. The Church of Rome has had its General Councils, but they were composed on the basis of

ecclesiastical prerogative; our General Conferences, on the doctrine of fraternal equality, and the necessities of the Church. These assemblages were generally opened with prayer and fasting, and the preaching of the word. The Spirit of God was also present, and revivals at such times were common. We may follow along the track of the Annual and General Conferences till 1816, when Bishop Asbury appears no more among his living compeers and the multitudes of his spiritual children. But his memory and his deeds, may we not say, his spirit, hovered like a grand presence over M'Kendree, Emory, Roberts, and George. His last few months of labor had been a living martyrdom. He was carried into the house and out again to his horse by his faithful Henry. And when another traveling companion had succeeded to such a care, the loving Henry, on hearing the tidings of his sickness, hastens to his bedside, and assists, with his colleagues, in nursing day and night the venerable bishop, until he partially recovers. He mounts his horse again, gives his loving counsels to his beloved son in the Gospel, and then rides away to be seen no more.

Henry Boehm traveled longer with Bishop Asbury than any other man, knew him most intimately, and gives us a life-picture of him; describing his dress, manner, preaching, conversation, and prayers. The influence of a great mind on an infant Church is tremendous. But the true measure of Bishop Asbury's giant will is the great men he controlled with such ease, and whom he made to love him. Jesse Lee, Gatch, Owen, Colbert, Tunnell, M'Kendree, Emory, such were the men Bishop Asbury ruled with wisdom; while O'Kelly and Shinn were met and measured in a different way, but all successfully for the Church. The work of Henry Boehm is invaluable to the Church for the light that it sheds on Asbury alone. The death of Asbury gloomed over the General Conference of 1816. From that point a new era opens. Hitherto the influence, life, and genius of one man had risen serenely above the Church to rule and guide it. In one sense he was the Church. Now the General Conference rises into importance, and the influence of individual men, even of bishops, dwindles. It is true, several superintendents instead of one, like serene stars, soar above the horizon. M'Kendree and Emory are stars of the first magnitude, but they soon pass from the

field of vision, and the General Conference itself fills the view. Its first great conflicts are with slavery. In 1844 the Church itself is divided on this question by a plan of separation. It is true, many supposed the General Conference here transcended its powers. Its record on this subject shows an almost continued advance till, in 1864, it sends a deputation of venerable men to encourage Abraham Lincoln in the noble work of proclaiming to four millions a full emancipation from the dreadful curse of slavery. The General Conference has also mapped out the great mission work, erected its great book concerns, established depositories, started newspapers and reviews, elected editors, books agents, missionary secretaries, and bishops. It has appointed the bounds of conferences, heard and decided appeals, made rules and regulations for the Church, and sent its greetings to other councils and conferences in distant parts of the earth. The General Conference is the august senate of the Church, and no doubt has before it arduous and glorious work in the future.

V. Let us gather up here from our author the scattered grains of gold. How many names in this record can receive only a passing notice, and yet will have most honorable mention in the book of life! In reading these pages one feels that he is treading, amid holy memories, along the sounding cobwebed corridors of time. There was Phineas Rice of the old New York Conference. We have one anecdote of him. When first uniting with conference, in 1809, and ordained deacon, "the conference voted that he was 'too funny,' and passed the resolution that Bishop M'Kendree should reprove him. The bishop did so. Years after Mr. Rice said that as he had never been to conference before, he supposed that this was the regular process that all young ministers went through, and therefore did not feel at all unpleasant."—P. 236.

Many well remember how Phineas Rice could, almost in the same breath, move a congregation to smiles, or melt them to tears. But he is gone, with Martindale, Jewett, and others.

Jesse Lee, too, was a man of great wit. At the Virginia Conference of 1813, in Newbern, North Carolina, he preached from Acts xvii, 6, "These that have turned the world upside down," etc. "His propositions were: 1. That originally the

moral world was right side up. 2. Sin had turned it wrong side up. 3. It was the design of the Gospel, and the business of the ministry, to restore it to its original position. The next morning nearly everything about the town looked ridiculous, being upside down. Wagons, boats, signs, gates, almost everything, was bottom side upward. Some of the inhabitants were vexed, and some laughed; while the authors of the mischief enjoyed the fun, and laid it to the preacher, who, they said, had come to turn the town over, that it might be right side up."—P. 412.

At another time there was a more real upturning. In Vermont the Congregationalists were the standing order, and the Methodists were taxed, with others, for their support. Having to support their own ministry, they petitioned the legislature to have the law repealed. "Their petitions were treated with contempt, and the inquiry was sneeringly made, 'Who are the Methodists?' affecting to be ignorant of such a people. The Methodists in the state concluded if this was the kind of treatment they were to receive it was time to show who they were; so they and their friends had an understanding, and at the election the next year there was, to the astonishment of many, a general turning over. The new governor and legislature found out who the Methodists were, and the obnoxious law was repealed." The reader of Henry Boehm's book is struck with the frequent recurrence of names that have become familiar during the war of the rebellion. Washington, Norfolk, Newbern, Spottsylvania, Richmond, Charleston, and other similar names, meet the eye, to remind us that our fathers often marched over this ground which has since been trampled by contending armies. A comparison of these two great conflicts may not be unprofitable, and the result in either case is not doubtful. The truth is mighty, and it shall prevail. In both conflicts there is often resisting unto blood striving against sin. The father of John Cooper threw a shovel of hot embers on him, and then expelled him from the house. The saintly and heroic Gatch was mobbed, tarred and feathered, but never quailed. Garrettson was assaulted with a club, and left covered with blood. From the grated windows of jails the imprisoned itinerant preached to the multitudes without, and the word of God was not bound. Most of these

pioneers lived to see the truth established, and flourishing Churches cover the land. They were Christian heroes and true patriots. Asbury, discouraged at the little fruit of his ministry, (and what true itinerant is not?) glides unobserved into a love-feast far out in the wilderness. He sits conversing with his own troubled thoughts, until a sister rises to speak, and tells the people that she was awakened under a sermon preached by Bishop Asbury. The aged bishop springs to his feet, and delares that he is ready to travel round the continent if he can see even thus much fruit brought to God. In 1788 Bishop Asbury, on his way to Charleston, finds an old colored man, named Punch, fishing on the bank of a creek. Punch's character had been bad. The bishop rides up to him, and inquires, "Punch, did you ever pray?" The reply is, "No, sir." The bishop talks to him; Punch is alarmed. The bishop sings for him, "Plunged in a gulf of dark despair we wretched sinners lay," and the tears roll down the swarthy cheeks of his solitary auditor. The bishop rides away. Punch throws down his fish-pole and starts for home. To use his own language, "I been tink fore I got home Punch be gone to hell." Punch became a converted man. He preached to his own people. The overseer forbade him. Then the overseer became converted, and the word spread still more. Some twenty or twenty-five years afterward, during Bishop Asbury's last visit to Charleston, Punch traveled sixty or seventy miles on foot to Charleston to see him. Years after that the South Carolina Conference sent a missionary to the colored people, in obedience to the request of some gentlemen of wealth. The missionary came to the cabin where Punch lived. An aged man with wrinkled and palsied limbs came to the door, but there was glory in his face. He looked on the missionary in silence, then raising his eyes to heaven said, "Now Lord, lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." The visitor was confused, but the old man said, "I have many children in this place. I have felt for some time past that my end was nigh. I have looked around to see who might take my place when I am gone. I could find none. I felt unwilling to die and leave them so, and have been praying to God to send some one to take care of them. The Lord has sent you, my child; I am ready to

go."* He died in a few days, and left two or three hundred people, whom he had gathered together, to the care of the missionary. The successors of Asbury have a duty which they owe to the lowly. The colored man greatly exalted by freedom, must be still more exalted by Christ.

Let us pause a moment over the testimonies of the dying ministers of Christ. These are a few golden sands wrenched from the grasp of death. The last words of "the great Otterbein," as Bishop Asbury calls him, were, "The conflict is over; lay me down upon the pillow and be still." Guetthing, who was taken sick on a visit to Father Otterbein, and started for home but died before he reached it, suddenly said, "Hark! hark! who spoke? whose voice is that I hear? Light, light, what golden light! Now all is dark again. Please help me out of bed." He said "Let us sing 'Come thou long expected moment." He knelt and offered prayer. He was helped into bed, folded his hands across his bosom, and in fifteen minutes was in Paradise. William Gill quietly fell asleep in death, and closed his own eyes. William Jessup said, when dying, "My work is done. Glory, glory!" Hope Hull, while dying, was asked concerning his spiritual state, and replied, "God has laid me under marching orders, and I am ready to obey." While prayer was offered at the dying bed of Jesse Lee, he broke out in ecstacies, "Glory, glory, Jesus reigns! heaven is just before me." He also said the next day, "Give my respects to Bishop M'Kendree; tell him that I die in love with all the preachers, and that he lives in my heart." He said, "Brother Boehm, when I die I wish you to close my eyes." The aged Asbury as he passed on his way proclaiming Christ, cried out in rapture, "Hail, all hail eternal glory!" And the quiet words of M'Kendree, "All is well," still linger like the words of a parting benediction upon the Churches.

But we must hasten and take our leave of the volume that has given us so much pleasure. The same field is traversed by various honored writers, Wakeley, Strickland, Dr. G. Peck, and our worthy historian, Dr. Abel Stevens. Let our venerable Father Boehm give his own parting word to the reader.

* "Heroes of Methodism," by Rev. J. B. Wakeley, p. 29.

"In May, 1800, I was present at the General Conference in Baltimore; in May, 1864, I attended the General Conference in Union Church, Philadelphia. With perhaps two exceptions, Drs. C. Elliott and G. Peck, all the delegates to the latter body were born during the intervening period; and the senior bishop, Thomas A. Morris, was, in 1800, a prattling boy of five years. I rejoice that God had raised up so many strong men to be pillars in the Church. Some were from the farther West, California, Oregon, and regions which in my early days were uninhabited, except by wandering tribes of Indians. The bishop and members seemed to regard me as an old Methodist patriarch, and honored me with a seat on the platform."—P. 489.

Farewell dear old man! May your age continue to its close thus serenely bright; and may the mantle of the fathers fall upon their sons. To you at least there is the prospect of soon joining your compeers on the heavenly plains.

"There is a countrie,
Afar beyond the stars,
Where stands a winged sentrie,
All skillful in the wars.
There, above noise and danger,
Sweet Peace sits crowned with smiles,
And One, born in a manger,
Commands the beauteous files."

VI. We are brought in view of our centenary. American Methodism completes its first hundred years in October. Dr. G. Peck has reached, with the present spring, his semi-centennial year, in the active ministry. Father Boehm has been sixty-four years in the ministry, was personally acquainted with the great men who laid the foundations of our Methodism, has looked on the days of the Declaration of Independence and of Washington, and has witnessed the dying struggles of the great rebellion. Our centenary has culminated in the year of peace. The stirring events of these hundred years have crystalized into history under the pen of Abel Stevens. But most of all do we pause to record, not the battles fought on fields of blood, but the peaceful marches of the everlasting Gospel. Between one fifth and one fourth of the whole population are gathered under the ministry of this one great Church and its branches. Well may we ascribe the glory to the great

Saviour and Head of the Church, saying, "What hath God wrought! "His work is honorable and glorious, and his righteousness endureth for ever." Let us, with such a past to commemorate, while we despise not architectural grandeur, build our chief monument of redeemed hearts. Already has much precious fruit been garnered in heaven. The moral achievements of the present will be the best tribute to the glory of the past.

VII. The future! How shall we meet it? The population of this country in 1900 will be about one hundred millions. The centenary of Methodism is to be a *preparation* to meet the wants of this vast aggregate of humanity. We believe that Methodism is to bear a prominent part in the redemption of our world. She has the mission spirit and the missionary organization. She has the machinery. She has the wealth. She has the men. She has the *prestige* of success. And God is with her. Therefore we look upon her grand *preparations* as decisive. Our future must far transcend in results our most sanguine thought. The Church is hovering around the opening gates of the millennium. Let us be careful to preserve the ancient fire that burned on our rude altars. Let not the crown of glory fall from the brow of the sons of God. Other Christian Churches will have their work to perform; we rejoice in their success. But in the last ages there will be no denominational rivulets, but the Gospel tide, commingling in one ocean of divine love, "like a sea of glory," "shall spread from pole to pole."

---

## Art. V.—JOHN BRIGHT.

*Speeches of John Bright on the American Question.* With an Introduction. By Frank Moore. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1865.

*Boston Athenæum. Files of the London Times* from 1843–1865, etc. etc.

John Bright was born the 16th of November, 1811, at Greenbank, near Rochdale, in Lancashire, and is now, therefore, according to the English idea, just in the full strength of man-

hood, and competent, if ever, to exert a powerful influence on the national mind.

From the portrait which is given of him in the volume of Speeches on The American Question, we should judge him to be a fine specimen of a well-fed Englishman. His hair, which is not thick, but rather long and straight, is left without special arrangement, except an irregular parting on the left side. His whiskers give an appearance of exceeding broadness to the lower part of his face, which causes the forehead to seem disproportionately narrow, though high. His eyes are full and clear, and have a true and honest look; there is strength in the expression of the countenance, and a slumbering fire beneath the exterior repose. The nose is prominent and clearly cut; while the mouth, not large, but firmly closed, with corners slightly drawn down, in connection with the other features, gives an expression of determination and energy not to be mistaken. One can see at a glance that he is a man fearless of opposition from whatever source it may come; and possessing an honest conviction of the justness of his cause, the heavens might as soon be expected to fall as that he would yield a willing submission to wrong.

The chief business of the section of country where he was born is the manufacture of various fabrics, especially cotton. Mr. Bright's father was engaged in the manufacture of cotton. The son was early placed in a position to acquire a practical knowledge of the business. With only a limited education, he commenced his career under the immediate direction of his father. Until 1835 he diligently applied himself to the complete mastery of his business, at the same time devoting himself to the study of various branches of knowledge indispensable to a correct understanding of social science.

After traveling extensively on the continent and in Egypt and Palestine, he returned to England in 1838, and immediately commenced his public career, by taking an active interest in the Anti-Corn Law League.

It is said that at an early day Cobden, Bright, and Thompson formed a triumvirate to work in concert for the success of the League; Cobden taking the heavy work of bringing out the statistics, Bright appealing to the political interests of the people, and Thompson operating upon the religious feelings

of the masses. Well and faithfully did they perform their work, and it would be a difficult task to say which merits the most praise. At all events, Bright made himself felt throughout England by the influence of both voice and pen.

In 1843, being then but thirty-two years of age, he was defeated in a contest for the Parliamentary representation of the city of Durham; but his opponent having been rejected on account of bribery, he was successful in a new canvass. He continued to represent the city of Durham until the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846.

Mr. Bright's first speech in Parliament was made August 7, 1843, on a motion of Mr. Ewart, that the trade and industry of the country require further and more effectual relief, by the removal or reduction of duties which press on the raw material of manufactures, and on articles of interchange with foreign nations, as well as on the means of subsistence of the people.

After the mover and others had spoken, "The Times'" report of the debate informs us that "Mr. Bright, for whom there were some few calls, next rose and proceeded to address the House in a very rapid strain. The honorable member seemed a little nervous at first, but gained confidence as he went on." No one has ever read that plain, fearless speech without feeling that it came direct from the heart.

In 1847 he was returned to Parliament from the city of Manchester, by a coalition of the Free Trade and Ultra Liberal parties, and was again elected in 1852. From 1847 to 1857 he was especially active, both in Parliament and out of it, in devising and aiding reformatory measures. He was the sympathizing friend of the Irish in the year of famine; he foresaw the difficulties and dangers before the East Indian Government, and tried faithfully to avert or at least provide for them; he was personally interested in the welfare of that noble son of Hungary, the immortal Kossuth, and assisted at his reception in Manchester in 1852.

At the election of 1857, being absent on account of ill-health, he was brought forward by his friends as candidate for re-election from the city of Manchester, but owing to his opposition to the Palmerston policy and the Chinese war, was defeated, but was elected in the fall of the same year by

the city of Birmingham. From that time to this he has continued in Parliament, and stands to-day as one of the foremost men of the English nation.

During the four years of civil war through which we have just been passing, we have had no more earnest and influential friend in Great Britain or the continent than honest John Bright. When, from the high places of power, we have received only the haughty sneer, or the coolest contempt, his heart has ever truly beat for us, and his faith in the ultimate triumph of the North has never wavered. Though an immense sufferer in his business by the war, yet he has endured it bravely, and by word and deed has done his best to relieve and encourage the distressed and almost starving population of the manufacturing districts.

In a speech delivered January 15, 1863, at Birmingham, on the subject of international law, he defends, in a masterly manner, the policy of the United States, and administers a scathing rebuke to "The Times," while he most clearly shows up the falsity of all its prophecies in regard to American affairs. He then goes on to say:

Within the last two years we have seen two events which posterity will regard as very important. In Russia serfdom has been put in the way of extinction by the act of the emperor of Russia and his government; in the United States, by the most wonderful series of events, there is evidently coming to pass that which no man dared to hope for three years ago as likely to be approached during the lifetime of any one of us. I see from the East unto the West, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, in spite of what misled, prejudiced, unjust, and wicked men may do, the cause of freedom still moving onward; and it is not in human power to arrest its progress,

> "For God from evil still educes good,
> And Freedom's seed still grows, though steeped in blood."

Again his appreciation of our condition and his fearless faith in our future is expressed in the following quotation from a speech delivered at Birmingham December 18, 1862. He closes by saying:

I cannot believe that civilization in its journey with the sun will sink into endless night to gratify the ambition of the leaders of this revolt, who seek to

> "Wade through slaughter to a throne
> And shut the gates of mercy on mankind."

I have a far other and brighter vision before my gaze. It may be but a vision, but I will cherish it. I see one vast confederation stretching from the frozen North in unbroken line to the glowing South, and from the wild billows of the Atlantic westward to the calmer waters of the Pacific main; and I see one people, and one law, and one language, and one faith, and over all that wide continent the home of freedom, and a refuge for the oppressed of every clime.

It is well known that President Lincoln declared this passage to be one of the finest efforts of oratory he had ever read. Surely the most enthusiastic American has never indulged in a more exultant anticipation of the future of the Republic. It is not surprising that Mr. Bright, with such a faith, has has been one of our bravest champions.

Nor has he rested with merely a defense of the North and its institutions; he has truthfully portrayed and justly denounced the traitors and the treason of the South. In his speech of December 18, 1862, he says of the rebellion that "it is a great conspiracy against humanity; that slavery is blasphemously set up to be its chief corner-stone; that it has been the huge foul blot upon the fame of the American Republic; that it is a hideous outrage against human right and divine law." In the same speech he says, "I blame the men who are eager to admit to the family of nations a state which offers itself to you as based upon a principle, I will undertake to say, more odious and blasphemous than was ever heretofore dreamed of in Christian or pagan, in civilized or savage time."

In the House of Commons, June 30, 1863, Mr. Bright, in speaking on the motion of Mr. Roebuck to recognize the Southern Confederacy, said, "In the hands of God are alike the breath of man and the life of states. I am willing to commit to him the issues of the dreaded contest; but I implore of him, and I beseech of this House, that my country may lift nor hand nor voice in aid of the most stupendous act of guilt that history has recorded in the annals of mankind." Quotations such as these might be largely multiplied; but these will suffice to show the justness of his appreciation of the great questions at issue, and the character of the parties engaged in the contest.

But aside from Mr. Bright's connection with American

affairs, there are three interesting phases in which he presents himself to our consideration: 1. As an orator. 2. As a politician. 3. As a reformer.

I. As an orator, everything about him, as far as we can judge from his portrait, marks him as one in earnest. We readily perceive, from a perusal of his speeches, that he is sometimes enthusiastic and impassioned in his style, and withal there is an evident poetical vein about him which frequently reveals itself, though usually he is severely plain in his use of language. His forms of expression are terse and strong, and the hard-working mechanic, the factory operative, and the tradesman do not fail to understand his straightforward Saxon talk. He goes directly to his point, leaving no chance, even to the careless, to lose sight of the purpose of the speaker. He never talks simply for the sake of talking. He can sit and hear the debates in Parliament, verbose, dull, and dreary as they are, until a fitting occasion presents itself, and then with a single dash brushing away the cobweb sophisms of his opponents, he meets their arguments fairly and squarely only to demolish them, and then builds up his own argument with care and fortifies it with skill. Each sentence fits its place like a well-wrought block in a line of solid masonry. He can be sarcastic to a degree which must cut to the quick, and the flashes of his wit are sometimes brilliant in the extreme. With a pleasant voice that has both volume and compass, with a distinct enunciation, and a total freeness from all disagreeable peculiarities or affected mannerisms, he possesses great advantages as a public speaker.

It must suffice to give a single specimen of his style, taken from a speech made before the Trades' Unions of London, March 26, 1863. He says, speaking of the American civil war, "Privilege" (referring to the aristocracy and upper classes) "thinks it has great interest in it, and every morning, with blatant voice, it comes into your streets and curses the American Republic. Privilege has beheld an affecting spectacle for many years past. It has beheld thirty millions of men happy and prosperous, without emperor, without king, without the surroundings of a court, without nobles, except such as are made by eminence in intellect and virtue, without state bishops and state priests, without great armies and great navies, without

great debt and without great taxes. Privilege has shuddered at what might happen to old Europe if this grand experiment should succeed. But you, the workers—you, striving after a better time—you, struggling upward toward the light with slow and painful steps, you have no cause to look with jealous eyes upon a country which among all the great nations of the globe is that one where labor has met with the highest honor, and where it has reaped its greatest reward. . . . In the United States there has been, as you know, an open door for every man, and millions have entered into it and have found rest. . . . Do not, then, give the hand of fellowship to the worst foes of freedom that the world has ever seen, and do not, I beseech you, bring down a curse upon your cause which no after penitence can ever lift from it. You will not do this. I have faith in you. Impartial history will tell that, when your statesmen were hostile or coldly neutral, when many of your rich men were corrupt, when your press—which ought to have instructed and defended—was mainly written to betray, the fate of a continent and its vast population being in peril, you clung to freedom with unfaltering trust that God in his infinite mercy will yet make it the heritage of all his children." No candid and intelligent person who reads the above can fail to perceive that for real eloquence it will compare favorably with the finest passages of English or American orators.

II. We come now to consider Mr. Bright as a politician. The traits of character which we have already seen manifesting themselves distinguish him in his political career. He seldom consults the expedient; what is right, is the question which most attracts his attention. There is a degree of integrity about him, which is truly refreshing. It can never be said of him, as it was once said of one of our most distinguished politicians, that

> "He wiggles in and wiggles out,
> And leaves the people still in doubt
> Whether the snake that made the track
> Was going south or coming back."

Conscience, and not greed of gain or fame, directs his course. Hence he is a man the people trust; they look to him as the champion of popular rights, and he has never failed them.

He is a man of foresight. His expectations in regard to the ultimate success of our struggles, even in our darkest days,

show not only his just perception of the case, but also his statesmanlike grasp of the future. His action to secure the appointment of a parliamentary committee to investigate the affairs of India in 1849 and 1850, proves that he anticipated the terrible mutiny of 1857, and also that he foresaw the probability of a civil war in the United States, or some other convulsion of political society, which would inevitably and seriously disturb the currents of trade throughout the whole civilized world. His course of reasoning was, that the products of slave labor are subject to violent and extensive fluctuations, and therefore it might be expected that the vast supply of cotton from the United States might be partially or wholly cut off at any hour. Hence, by the adoption of liberal measures toward the natives of India, he proposed at the same time to elevate their condition and apply a healthy stimulus to the cultivation of the important staple.

III. Viewed as a reformer, John Bright stands among the pre-eminent men of his time.

There are five principal topics which, at present, are under discussion by the reformers of England:

1. Pauperism. This evil is known to be gigantic in its proportions. One sixth of the people of the United Kingdom are the recipients of charity, more than one million being absolutely and hopelessly paupers, while nearly two millions more are just on the verge of the same condition. The problem is, whether, by legislation, anything can be done to remove, or at least mitigate, the source of unspeakable misery. The wretched poverty of this vast multitude, it is well known, is the fruitful occasion of crime. Wickedness of every kind prevails, and increases with frightful rapidity. Infanticide, the occasional conclusion of wide-spread licentiousness, is only one form in which the deep moral pollution of society reveals itself. Facts might be adduced showing the relation of the upper classes to the lowest which would rival the worst examples of lust ever known on southern plantations. The reformers claim that there is at least a partial remedy in a judicious modification of existing laws, or the introduction of new enactments.

2. The second topic is the reduction of the public expenditures. The nation of thirty-one million inhabitants is burdened with a yearly expenditure of £70,000,000, nearly equal

to $500,000,000 of our legal currency. Most men know that at least the great proportion of all public expense comes from the hard hands of honest toil. It must be seen at a glance, that a sum so enormous can be raised, from such a limited number of people, for a long series of years, only by the most burdensome exactions and consequent deprivation of the severest kind on the part of the laboring classes. Home comforts, pleasant cottages, books, education, must all be foregone; the prime necessities of life can only be obtained as the result of patient and ceaseless toil; and happy is the man who lives without the aid of charity, and thrice happy he who is able to secure a decent Christian burial at last, and not fill the grave of a pauper. The English reformers are resolved that there shall be a reduction of this frightful drainage upon the resources of the people.

3. The monopoly of the soil is another question of interest. The fact that there are only thirty thousand landowners in the whole kingdom, and that this number is rapidly diminishing from year to year, betokens a phase of political economy which promises little for the future security and happiness of the the people. Here, again, it is proposed to invoke the aid of legislation.

4. The oppression of Ireland is another subject of discussion. The dumb wrongs of ages are finding a voice at last, and if Fenianism proves a political failure, there are still stout English hearts which will never cease to throb in sympathy until deserved equality and freedom is enjoyed by the Irish people.

5. The question of suffrage, however, just now, commands the most attention. It is a singular coincidence that while the propriety of extending the elective franchise to the blacks is one of the disturbing elements in American politics, the extension of the same right is considered a fundamental reform in the politics of England, for it is fondly hoped that if this reform can be carried through successfully the others will follow as a natural consequence.

John Bright is evidently a believer in the theory of De Tocqueville, who says,* "When a nation begins to modify the elective qualification, it may be easily foreseen that, sooner or later, that qualification will be entirely abol-

* Democracy in America, vol. ii, p. 71.

ished." There is no more invariable rule in the history of society: the further electoral rights are extended, the greater is the need of extending them; for after each concession the strength of the democracy increases, and its demands increase with its strength. The ambition of those who are below the appointed rule is irritated in exact proportion to the great number of those who are above it. The exception at last becomes the rule, concession follows concession, and no stop can be made short of universal suffrage.

Mr. Bright states the whole question of the franchise reform in a single sentence in a speech delivered at Rochdale, November 24, 1863, where he says, "There are 7,000,000 of men upward of twenty years of age in Great Britain, and 6,000,000 have no more direct political power than if they lived in the most despotic country of Europe." What he hopes to secure as the result of his project of suffrage may be seen from two other extracts from the same speech. He says: "I believe if the people of this country were really represented, if the wisdom and justice of the English people, and not the prejudice and selfishness of classes, directed the internal and external policy of this land, we should find the great bulk of our people raised in a few years to a much higher platform of comfort, intelligence, morality, and independence than has ever yet been known in the realm of England. I believe, for example, that if the people were thoroughly represented, five years would not elapse—probably three years would not elapse—before there was established a system of education, universal and complete, for all the people, equal to that which now stands alone in the world, that which is offered to the people of the New England States of North America." Again he says, speaking of the United States, "And there there are no 6,000,000 of grown men—I speak of the free States—excluded from the constitution of the country and the electoral franchise; there there is a free Church, a free school, free land, a free vote, and a free course for the child of the humblest born in the land." These are the blessings he desired to secure for his own countrymen, and he has faith that if once the ballot is put into their hands they will not be slow to rise to the full height of manhood's privilege. No man labors more persistently and successfully to accomplish these great reforms than Mr. Bright. He strikes hard blows at the aristoc-

racy, the landed privileges, and the various time-honored abuses with which England is so liberally cursed.

As a reformer, Mr. Bright is in hearty sympathy with the common people. His life and early training have brought him into contact with them, and his great heart takes in their needs and their distresses. There is no wonder that he carries the people with him when we remember that he addresses them in words such as we have already quoted, as well as the following when he says, "I ask, shall we believe that it is an unchangeable decree of the Most High that more than one half of the population of this country shall live in houses of not more than £5 yearly value, and that their children shall grow up, in comparison with those of the wealthy classes, to a large extent uncared for and untaught? that life with them shall be but one long struggle to live, and that the sunshine which falls upon and athwart our path shall only to them be the gilding of the land which they see afar off, but which they can never hope to attain." One can scarcely imagine the effect that words such as these must have upon the minds of suffering, starving, downtrodden men.

Though "The Times," in its issue of November 25, 1863, reviewing the speeches of Cobden and Bright, delivered at Rochdale the day before, throws out the heartless taunt that nothing had been accomplished by Bright and his fellow-reformers, except to make bread cheaper and extend trade, though the aristocrats and privileged classes may hate and contemn him, he can well afford to endure the taunt of the one and the hate of the others as long as he knows that millions of the suffering poor, even the little hungry children, bless his name as they eat with thankful hearts the larger loaf his labor in their behalf has enabled them to procure. With his sublime faith in God and humanity, he may yet live to see the day when the desires of his heart will be realized, when England, rid of the evils which afflict her people, shall start forth on a new career of prosperity and power. God will be his help in the future as in the past while he continues to serve his fellow-men; and though perhaps he may fall before the work in which he is engaged is fully accomplished, other laborers will be raised up who will prosecute to ultimate and complete success the glorious task commenced.

## Art. VI.—RELATIONS OF THE COLORED PEOPLE TO THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

It is a happy coincidence that the Centenary of American Methodism is ushered in at the auspicious moment when nearly thirty million people are rejoicing in the peace and security consequent upon the close of a protracted civil war, and the restoration of a long-distracted and imperiled Union. Scarcely have the echoes of the nation's pean died away among the distant hills, when from the courts of the living God there comes forth another joyous strain, celebrating the amazing triumphs of the cross. Amid the blended notes of patriotic and religious exultation there is heard still another song of gladness. It is no discordant sound, but one which chimes in beautiful consonance with the rest. It is the negro's jubilee melody. With grateful heart he pours forth his tender and pathetic strains, while the chains of more than two centuries of hard servitude lie in broken fragments at his feet. He looks up to the serene sky above him, and thanks God that wherever its blue concave spreads out over the states and territories of the grand Republic, it looks not down upon a single human being bound in the fetters of slavery. He sees streaming from some lofty height the "star-spangled banner," and hails it as the emblem of that mighty power which, hurling the long dominant slave power from its throne, proclaimed his perpetual emancipation. In the fervor of his devout fancy he sees culminating above that victorious banner the "Star of Bethlehem," emblazoned upon a celestial ensign, bearing the motto *In hoc signo vinces*, which bids him rejoice in hope of a more blessed enfranchisement than any earthly government can bestow—liberty from sin, emancipation from the chains of ignorance and vice.

At this momentous juncture let us review his relations to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in connection with the efforts which have been made for his evangelization.

The history of Southern Methodist evangelism in behalf of the negro may be conveniently divided into three periods. The first extends from the origin of American Methodism in 1766 to the establishment of the first missions among the

slaves in 1829; the second from the origin of these missions to the epoch of the ecclesiastic division, or secession, in 1845; the third extends to 1861, the epoch of political secession and the civil war. Each of these chronological periods is marked with distinctive data.

1766–1829. The Methodists from the very beginning of their labors on this continent, manifested a deep interest in the spiritual welfare of the colored people. They regarded them as their kindred, children of the same common Father, made by the same Creator, redeemed by the same atoning sacrifice, and fellow-heirs of the same immortality. They felt deeply for the black man as an *oppressed* member of the universal family, and were willing to encounter peril, to make sacrifices, and to labor unceasingly for his salvation. Their settled opposition to slavery intensified the interest which they felt for him, and they often wept over his wrongs, and rejoiced with him in his spiritual consolations. The first missionaries whom Mr. Wesley sent to America were thoroughly imbued with his own antislavery ideas. Rankin, Shadford, Asbury, Coke, and Whatcoat were all as radically opposed to slavery as was Wesley or Wilberforce; but they knew how to act prudently, and to gain the good will of masters, while they taught the slaves the unsearchable riches of the Gospel. Their early native converts and itinerant coadjutors were also thoroughly Wesleyan in their views of slavery as well as of doctrine and discipline. Watters, Abbott, Gatch, Garrettson, all were of one mind on this subject. Some of them, as Gatch and Garrettson, becoming owners of slaves, either by inheritance or marriage, took the earliest opportunity to set them free. Many, both among the preachers and people, followed their example. In fact, that illustrious line of heroic evangelists who for more than half a century adorned the annals of American Methodism, with united voice, and in the most emphatic manner that it is possible for men to express their profoundest thoughts and emotions, *declared* their opposition to slavery; and their declaration has won from the lips of all Christendom the commendation of "a noble testimony." Among these "bright and shining lights" not one could be found who was at all tinctured with proslavery doctrines.

It is not strange that these men of God should entertain

such views, when, at that time, there were men of the world, and among them not a few who were wealthy slaveholders, who entertained the same opinions. There were, during this period, in Virginia, Maryland, and other slaveholding colonies or states, many eminent statesmen, none of whom seemed to think that slavery was "the normal condition of the negro," nor that a state of slavery constituted the *ne plus ultra* of social and political perfection.

We cannot wonder, then, that the early itinerant preachers took special pains to instruct the colored people, wherever they could get access to them, in the fundamental principles of the religion of Christ. They neither overlooked the negroes in their daily ministrations, nor forgot them in the record of their successes. In the diaries of their itinerancy they frequently mention in their congregations the presence of both whites and blacks, noting the fact that the Gospel had the same influence upon them both.

These pious evangelists were not without fruit to reward their toils. Philip Cox states that over one hundred blacks were converted in one day during the great revival on the Sussex circuit, Virginia, in 1787; and Asbury records that during the same year, on the same circuit, there were not less than one thousand four hundred white and black persons converted. The General Minutes of the same year set down the whole number of colored members at one thousand eight hundred and ninety. Good was not only accomplished in this way, but the blacks, in their turn, did something to help forward the good cause. Many a tempted, toil-worn, disheartened itinerant has been cheered and encouraged in his heroic career by colored Christians. Caleb B. Peddicord, when he was laboring under great mental depression, and doubting his call to preach, was greatly encouraged and strengthened by a colored woman who had been converted under his ministry. There is also a tradition in the South that Bishop M'Kendree, in the early years of his ministry, when he was tempted to give up his circuit, was induced to resume his labors by the earnest exhortations of a colored man.

During this period the colored people were served entirely by the regular circuit and station preachers. They had few, if any, houses of worship erected for their exclusive benefit.

A practice prevailed quite generally throughout the South of allotting to them a certain portion of the meeting-houses. The galleries, or a few seats in one end of the churches, were generally set apart for the blacks. Here they assembled at the same hours of service with the whites, and listened to the same discourses. But gradually a custom was adopted of extending larger accommodations to them by giving them the exclusive benefit of the afternoon services. When this was the case the preachers endeavored to adapt their discourses to their understandings. The meetings were characterized by great religious fervor, and were often accompanied with outbursts of excitement in which no small degree of extravagance and "wild-fire" appeared. After the institution of camp-meetings the negroes on such occasions enjoyed a spiritual feast. No matter whether the meetings were attended with much profit to the whites or not, they seldom failed so far as the blacks were concerned. A number of rude seats, commonly nothing better than unhewn logs, were arranged just in the rear of the preachers' "stand," or pulpit, and, though not half the blacks who usually attended these "feasts of tabernacles" could get a seat, they gathered around as near to the preacher as they could get, and often the tears they shed, their audible sobs and groans, their hearty "amens" and exultant shouts, attested the power of the word upon their hearts. At night, long after the whites had retired to their tents, the blacks would remain at the stand, spending hours in singing, prayer, and exhortation. The writer in his day has often lingered near them to witness their fervid exercises, and listen to exhortations often as eloquent and powerful as any that fell from the preachers of the more favored race. Words which, if they could have been written down at the time, would have been found worthy of a place in the permanent records of the Church, have thrilled his heart, and brought tears of unspeakable emotion from his eyes. So powerful were the displays of saving grace among these poor children of Ham, that an esteemed minister, while witnessing one of these enrapturing scenes, once remarked, "Surely the Shekinah is about to depart from the whites, and rests among these poor black people."

From 1787 to 1790 there must have been extraordinary

exertions on the part of the preachers for the salvation of the negroes, for the number of colored members increased during these three years from 1,890 to 11,652. For the succeeding twenty years, 1790–1810, the proportion of colored members was about one fifth of the whole membership of the Church; for the next twenty years, 1810–1830, the proportion was about one sixth of the whole. This reduction of the relative proportion was in consequence of the "Allenite secession," which caused a decrease in 1818 of about 4,000 colored members. Subsequently the rapid increase of population in the free states, and the proportionate spread of Methodism, reduced the relative proportion of colored members from one sixth to one seventh of the whole membership of the Church. But the following figures show that there was nevertheless a gradual and constant increase of colored members: 1790, 11,682; 1800, 13,452; 1,810, 34,724; 1820, 38,753; 1830, 69,383. In 1828, just before the origin of the first missions among them, there were 58,856 colored members.

It was during this period that the idea began to prevail extensively throughout the South, that the negro is constitutionally incapable of a high degree of mental or moral development. The idea has been greatly strengthened of late years by the plausible theories of scientific men. Dr. Morton's craniological investigations, enlarging the sphere of anthropological science, have tended to confirm many scientific men of the South in this opinion.

To the investigations of Dr. Morton may be added those of his learned friends and admirers, Dr. J. C. Nott, of Mobile, and G. R. Gliddon, formerly U. S. Consul at Cairo, in Egypt. In the "Types of Mankind" and "Indigenous Races," prepared by their joint labors, they seem to explore the whole field of philological, ethnological, archæological, and paleontological research in support of their favorite idea—the diverse origin of the various races of men. But while they have added to our stock of knowledge concerning the physical history of man, they have, in the view of all who adopt their favorite theory, weakened the authority of divine revelation. This is true of many highly cultivated southern minds. Some eminent statesmen seem to have imbibed their sentiments, and they have been defended by some leading secular journals. In

short, their works are well calculated to support the institution of slavery.

If the mean capacity of the Anglo-American's cranium should be fixed at ninety cubic inches, and that of the negro in this country at eighty, or at most eighty-five, it might be asked, if the circumstances of the two races were reversed, is it not likely that these proportions of cranial capacity would also be reversed? If the white man's education, physical, moral, and intellectual, had been utterly neglected during the period of nine or ten generations, and during the same period that of the negro should have been constantly promoted, is it not likely that the brain of the latter would have been larger than that of the former? Be this as it may, God, in his providence, sometimes sees fit to confound the wisdom of this world by giving historical prominence to cases which set at naught the pompous theories of "science falsely so called." It was during this period that two remarkable historic characters arose from among the colored converts. One was the case of "Black Harry," so admirably portrayed in Stevens's History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the other was "Punch," a fine sketch of whom was written by Dr. Wightman in 1847. Harry was Bishop Asbury's "traveling servant," Coke's "colleague" and Garrettson's companion in his mission to Nova Scotia. Dr. Rush said he was one of the greatest orators in America, and Coke pronounced him "the best preacher in the world." He preached acceptably to the whites in Philadelphia, sometimes filled the pulpit in place of one of the bishops, and was accounted more popular than Asbury himself. When it was announced that he would preach exclusively to the blacks, the whites would come to hear him too. He could hardly have been more popular or useful if, like his illustrious "colleague," he had been a graduate of Oxford. But what excites our astonishment, in contemplating such a character, is that he was perfectly illiterate, quite unable to read. The history of neither Church nor State can furnish an instance of such intellectual greatness in spite of an utter want of education; and certainly no unlettered white man ever attained such distinction as a public speaker, in America.

In 1788 Bishop Asbury, in one of his tours through South

Carolina, met with Punch, and after conversing with him on some of the cardinal points of the Gospel, sung and prayed with him. This interview led to the negro's conversion, and he began immediately to exhort his fellow-servants. His overseer, who at first persecuted him, was among his first converts, and became a preacher. Punch succeeded in building up a large society on the plantation where he belonged, and he continued to instruct and guide his people in the way of righteousness for a period of near half a century. In 1836 the first missionary was sent to the plantation. Punch, in extreme old age, supporting his trembling form upon his staff, met him at the door of his cabin, and received him with the exclamation, "Now, Lord, lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." He had for many years been praying that, before he took his departure from this world, the Lord would send some one to take charge of his spiritual children, and when the missionary came he felt that his prayer had been answered. Resigning his charge into the hands of the missionary, he took his departure, in peace and triumph, to his heavenly rest. Such cases are worthy of note, from the fact that God would teach us not to neglect either the intellectual or religious training of these people, under the notion that they are incapable of improvement in these respects.

1829–1845. The Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church had been in existence over nine years, and $36,878 had been collected and expended by it on the various fields under its care. As yet not one dollar had been spent in preaching the Gospel among the slaves of the South. Why did the Church so long neglect this inviting field? The answer is given, in part, by Dr. Capers as follows:

An inveterate prejudice against having religious instruction imparted to the slaves by Methodist preachers, it is well known, had excluded our ministry, almost without exception, from the thousands who are employed on the rice plantations, sea-island cotton plantations, and indeed generally along the seaboard of this state; so that, long as we have labored in the Gospel ministry in this country, we are now but just beginning to carry to the most numerous and most needy portions of our colored population the blessings of the Gospel of Christ. Indeed, our present endeavors amount to little more than an experiment, as we trust God shall open the way fully and completely, at no distant time, to the gen-

eral dissemination of truth and righteousness among the negroes of the larger estates of the low country, who, hitherto, have been most emphatically "sitting in the region and shadow of death."

As yet the Gospel had not been preached by the Methodists to any great extent in the neighborhood of the large plantations. Not many of them were embraced in the regular circuits, and even when they were embraced in them the discipline of those plantations forbade the negroes leaving them, or congregating on neighboring estates. It was in reference to visiting these, with a view of instructing the blacks, that there was "an inveterate prejudice." The special distrust of Methodist preachers, alluded to by Dr. Capers, was owing to the well-known antislavery Discipline of their Church. This prejudice, however, began at length to subside, and a number of concurrent events opened the way for the founding of missions among the slaves on the large estates of the low country. What Isaac Taylor says of Methodism, that it "had its rise among a number of springs of equal volume," was true of these missions.

In 1828 the preachers on the Orangeburg circuit, South Carolina, found their way to the plantation of a Mr. Bearing, on the Combahee, where he had fitted up a chapel for the accommodation of his slaves, and invited the preachers to preach to them. In the following year this, with a number of neighboring plantations, was included in the mission established on the south of Ashley river. About the same time Col. Lewis Morris invited Dr. Capers to attend his place on the Edisto for the purpose of baptizing some of his black people who had previously found means of attaching themselves to the Church. In 1828, a pious and zealous local preacher (Rev. J. E. Godfrey) was employed to oversee a rice plantation in the neighborhood of Savannah. He forthwith began to impart religious instruction to the slaves under his care. In the fall of that year Hon. C. C. Pinckney, a friend of the proprietor, visited the place, and noticed the salutary effects of the overseer's instructions. Returning home, he called on Dr. Capers to know if he could recommend to him a Methodist exhorter as superintendent for his plantation on the Santee. Dr. Capers told him that he would request the bishop to send him a preacher for whose character he would vouch. Accord-

ingly, the next year Rev. Mr. Massey was appointed to the Santee Mission, and forthwith began his labors. The following is the account Dr. Capers, who accompanied him, gives of his first visit to the plantations:

Apprised of the principal points of jealousy or distrust on the part of the owners, we proposed to make each plantation a distinct preaching place, confining our congregations to the negroes resident on the spot. The day was to be improved in the service of the children and invalids, and the evening for teaching and preaching among the laborers. Nine rice plantations on the Santee were at once put under our instructions. We have reason to believe that, thus far, we have been of service to the blacks at each one of these places, particularly those of the Messrs. Pinckney, and that the favorable opinion of the proprietors, both as to the unoffensiveness and usefulness of our labors, has not been diminished. The whole time of the missionary has been devoted to the work, with much patience, meekness, and self-denial.

Dr. Capers was emphatically the apostle and founder of the Southern Methodist missions among the blacks. No man in the South was as well fitted as he to devise and set in motion such a scheme. In South Carolina he was universally respected and beloved. After Calhoun he was the most popular man in the state. He was allied to the "aristocracy," connected with the first families, and had over all classes unbounded influence. Himself a slaveholder, no one could for a moment question his fidelity to Southern interests. Universally admired for his talents, loved for his amiability, esteemed for his dignified urbanity and ministerial integrity, as well as revered for his piety, he was the man to begin and superintend, as he did for a number of years, these interesting domestic missions. To aid the missionaries as much as possible in their efforts to impart oral instruction to the negro children, he composed a catechism, which for simplicity, comprehensiveness, and adaptation, hardly admits of any improvement.

At first the field was a very contracted one, a mere experiment on the plantations of a few individuals, who became suddenly impressed with the importance of the work. During the following year (1830) two additional missions were established, Savannah River and Little River. In 1831 Pon Pon, in South Carolina, was added. In 1832 there were three in South Carolina and four in Georgia. In 1833 there were sixteen missions in those two States; and the whole list of mis-

sions in 1834 numbered twenty, namely: ten in South Carolina, nine in Georgia, and one in Nashville, Tennessee. In 1835 the good work extended to Alabama, and Pickens' Mills Mission was formed with twenty-three appointments. The last Report of the Missionary Society prior to the division of of the Church presents the following results: There were embraced in the colored missions of the South Carolina Conference, 7,929 members; Georgia Conference, 3,000; Tennessee, 368; Alabama, 1,267; Memphis, 1,940; Mississippi, 1,695; North Carolina, 25; making an aggregate of 16,224.

These figures do not set forth all the good which resulted from the negro missions. It must be remembered that these sixteen thousand converts were gathered up by missionaries on fields which were not reached by the regular circuit and station preachers. The successful efforts of the missionaries had operated advantageously for the colored congregations throughout the regular circuits and stations. The reports of the missionaries published every week in the religious papers, the proceedings at the Annual Conferences, the thrilling speeches made at the anniversaries of Conference Missionary Societies, the narration of striking incidents, of remarkable conversions and exemplifications of piety, and of death-bed experiences, stimulated the zeal of the preachers, and intensified their love for the souls of the colored people. Accordingly, we find the Minutes at the end of this period report 150,120 colored members in the Church. This was a net increase of 91,264 members since the close of the last period; an increase in the ratio of a little over 2.55 to one.

Let us now follow these self-denying missionaries as they go forth upon their sublime but perilous enterprise. It seems, indeed, as if the heroic age of Methodism has returned. Not counting their lives dear unto themselves, they go where malaria and sickness and death hold their carnival through the summer and autumnal months. Hard by the borders of miasmatic swamps; through the dense forests, draped in long pendent festoons of moss, as if the very trees were in mourning; along the ways that lead to the great rice and cotton fields; in spite of burning heat, of pestilential vapors, shaking agues, and malignant fevers, they wend their way from plantation to plantation and from hut to hut. Now, in some low, close, well-smoked

cabin, filled with infectious air, a dying slave languishes upon his pallet of straw. The self-forgetting man of God kneels by his side, and points him to the sinner's Friend. Again we hear his voice in accents of melting sweetness as he soothes the sorrows of some wounded spirit who seeks his spiritual counsels. Out on the green-sward, beneath the spreading branches of some venerable live-oak, there comes a smiling, happy group of sable juveniles. Their faces are all suffused with smiles, and their teeth of ivory-white fairly glitter between the lips of jet. They form a semicircle, with the missionary seated in their midst, and begin their weekly or semi-monthly recitation. They are happy now, for they have no care; their limbs are supple, not stiffened by age, nor broke by toil, nor emaciated by disease. With clear, strong musical voices, they answer in concert the questions from the catechism. They recite three or four chapters, and show that they have good memories; they answer other questions, as they are suggested by the text to the missionaries' mind, and show that they are apt scholars; leaving the questions they go on to the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and correctly reciting them all, they begin to sing. See how they delight in this exercise! Naturally endowed with the love of music, they make the very welkin ring with their joyous melody. The hymns finished, the missionary, after teaching them by his example how to pray, shakes them tenderly by the hand, mounts his horse and proceeds to the next plantation, where he follows the same routine.

Night at length closes in, and after partaking the hospitality of the overseer's table he proceeds to the "quarter," where, in one of the rude huts, he expounds the Gospel to as many as can get near enough to hear him. Here he meets one of the peculiar difficulties of his mission—to keep them awake while he imparts his brief instructions. The toils of the day are succeeded by the labor at the hand-mills, and the preparation of the supper, consisting only of corn bread or grits, potatoes or rice, with seldom a morsel of meat. It is nine o'clock in summer evenings before they can be assembled for worship, and "tired nature" too wont to seek her "sweet restorer," they can with great difficulty keep awake long enough to hear the preacher through.

Now the holy Sabbath has dawned upon the world, and all nature seems at rest. In the overseer's house, or in a barn, or out in the open air, beneath the evergreen foliage of those magnificent oaks which abound on the plantations of the low country, the people of the whole estate are assembled for public worship. The overseer and his family are present, and sometimes the preaching, which was intended only for the slaves, reaches their hearts, and they too are numbered with the "heirs of salvation." It may be the proprietor lives on his estate, and has erected a chapel for his people. If so, he and his family, with the overseer and his family, and some of their white neighbors, all attend, occupying the front seats, while all the remainder of the house is filled with blacks. It may be in some neighborhood where there is a church attached to some circuit; if so, the circuit preacher probably preaches in the week and the missionary on Sunday. The morning is devoted to services on behalf of the whites, and the afternoon to the blacks who assemble, to the number of several hundred, from the adjacent plantations. Sometimes quarterly meetings are held at these churches, and the sacraments are administered. Whenever a love-feast is held the black members are admitted along with the whites, only they sit on the back seats or in the galleries, and are served with the bread and water after all the whites have partaken. They are allowed also to relate their Christian experiences, and they sometimes do so to the edification of all present. On one of these occasions, in a village of Southern Georgia, a colored woman stood up in the gallery and began to speak. The first tones of her voice arrested the attention of all present, and every eye was turned toward her. Her face was glowing with smiles, her eyes streaming with tears, and meekness and modesty were visible in her appearance. She said, "Brothers and sisters, I have passed through many troubles, and it is of the Lord's mercy that I have not been consumed.. Before the missionary came here I was very wicked and very unhappy. It seemed to me that everything was against me. Death came and robbed me first of my parents, and then of my husband, and lastly of two of my children. I had but one left, and I thought I was like a tree whose branches, one after another, had been torn off by rude storms, until only one green bough was left. At last

another envious storm came passing by and tore even this one away. I was then left like the naked trunk, stripped and desolate. But just then the missionary came and told me to trust in Jesus. I gave God my heart, found rest for my soul, and have been happy ever since. Sometimes I ask, in doubt and fear, Will God, the great God, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, come down so low as to dwell in my poor heart? Brothers and sisters, I feel that he will. Yes, God, even my God, does now fill and bless my poor heart." The effect of this brief speech was sublime and overwhelming. The whole assembly burst into a flood of tears and rapturous praise.

But the missionary, amid his toils and successes, was in peril every hour. Watched with a jealous eye, pursued in all his movements by an uneasy restless suspicion, annoyed sometimes by the foolish apprehensions of some of the whites of insurrectionary plots among the slaves, and sometimes obliged to suspend his labors for months on this account, he was much like a person entering a powder magazine with a burning fagot in his hand. The slightest imprudence, an inadvertent remark, a hint of anything wrong in the institution of slavery or the conduct of either master or overseer, would have been the spark to precipitate a fatal explosion. It was not that he dreaded the pale, lank, tallow-faced "white trash," who inhabited the "wire grass" regions, or squatted among the sandhills, and cordially hated the "nigger preachers," for these could easily be quelled by a determined missionary; but the indifference of some masters, the obstacles thrown in his way sometimes by overseers, the ignorance and superstition of the blacks themselves, and the prediction that met him at every turn that the abolitionists would one day overturn the whole system of negro missions, were well calculated to dishearten and embarrass him. But, abating no jot of heart or hope, he toils on until it may be, he yields to the potent influence of climate, and falls a martyr to his work. At the next session of the conference the bishop, unwilling to appoint on his own responsibility, calls for volunteers. Heroic spirits are there, ready to follow in the steps of the beloved dead, and they come forth, each saying, "Here am I, send me." Thus it was from the beginning a work of love, a field of martyrdom, and

nobly have Southern preachers borne themselves in this glorious work.

1845–1861. This period, like the last, extended through sixteen years. The Church was now divided, and the missions to slaves, no longer under the care of the Methodist Episcopal Church, fell under the jurisdiction of the Church, South. The Report of the Missionary Society of the latter Church, for 1861, the last that was published, presents the following summary of results: Missions, 240; missionaries, 207; members in full connection, 65,413; on probation, 10,851; and 16,588 children under the instructions of the missionaries. These figures pertain exclusively to colored missions. The increase of members on the missions, including probationers, was at the rate of 4·70 to one. If our inquiries were to proceed no further, this would be a most flattering exhibit, and one that would seem to prove that the division of the Church had largely promoted the religious welfare of the black population. The missionary contributions, too, seem to have increased in like proportion. They had grown from about $80,000 in 1845, to $236,000 in 1861, and the aggregate sum for sixteen years had not been far from three million dollars. The missionary work had therefore prospered abundantly during this period. It would seem from this standpoint that the providential mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had been to provide religiously for the colored population, and so, we know, it has been regarded by many.

But when we come to the general statistics of the Church we read quite a different story. Not having the General Minutes of the Church, South, for 1861 at hand, if indeed they were ever published, we quote from the reports of Boards of Managers of Conference Missionary Societies at their last sessions.

The highest number of colored Church members, including probationers, which we have seen stated, is 206,000. The actual increase for this period was as 1·37 to one. During the period 1829–1845, when the missions were under the care of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the increase of colored members had been over 2·55 to one. Had the number increased in like proportion during the period 1845–1861, there should have been in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1861, over 380,000 colored members!

This is a startling development, if we view it in connection with the plea that was set up and argued so vehemently in 1844, that it was essential to the existence of the negro missions, and to the religious welfare of the colored people generally, that there should be a separate ecclesiastical organization for the South.

Much, indeed, had been said about the antislavery movements tending to destroy the missions among the slaves, and the North was warned from time to time that such would be the result of continuing to agitate the question of abolition. But let it be remembered, that the rise of these missions was almost contemporaneous with the origin of the great antislavery controversy, and that every planter in the South who favored these missions was well aware of the antislavery Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. As the abolition controversy waxed fiercer, the zeal for negro missions waxed warmer; as abolition societies multiplied at the North, missions among the slaves multiplied at the South; as plans and measures for the final extirpation of slavery were growing into grander proportions at the North, plans and measures for the salvation of the slaves were rapidly enlarging at the South. The truth is, the negro missions were never endangered by the abolition controversy. The missionaries were southern men; some of them slaveholders themselves, and nearly all of them avowed defenders of the institution of slavery. They were prudent in their intercourse with the slaves, confining themselves strictly to their religious instruction, and not interfering with their civil relations. Dr. Capers, the apostle and founder of the missions, was too well known, and stood too high in the confidence of slaveholders, for any of them to suppose that a cause which he approved, and which received his superintendence, could prove detrimental to the country. More than all, the labors of the missionaries were attended with the most beneficial results among the slaves. They became sober, truthful, honest, industrious, and obedient to their owners. A mission on any plantation became a source of clear pecuniary gain to the proprietor, and notwithstanding the gasconade of slaveholders, unfortunately too often repeated even by the ministers of religion, they had no idea of abandoning the missions, or expelling the missionaries

because there were abolitionists North of Mason and Dixon's line.

The most furious "fire-eaters" of South Carolina never demanded a division of the Church as a *sine qua non* for the continuance of the missionary work. The ecclesiastical "secession" was not therefore necessary for the religious welfare of the colored population.

The results of sixteen years' experiment by the new organization show indeed a rapid increase of the missionary work; but upon the whole, taking the state of the Church at large into view, a lamentable falling off. Had the unity of the Church been maintained, and the work among the blacks proceeded at the same rate of progress as at the time of the great schism, the number of colored members now in the Church would doubtless have been little below 400,000. The "great secession" was therefore alike disastrous to the interests of religion among blacks and white. A melancholy record have the last twenty years made. Every interest of piety, of patriotism, and material progress has suffered more or less in consequence of the Church in the South seceding from the high antislavery ground occupied by the illustrious fathers of Methodism in America.

But the great change has come at last. Slavery is "extirpated," and the question is now, What will the Church, South, do for the future welfare of the colored people? For their religious welfare it will continue to do in future what it has done in the past, according to its ability. But the ability is wanting. The missionary secretary notifies the conferences that there are large outstanding liabilities, and not a dollar in the treasury to meet them. Missionaries on foreign stations are suffering, and calling on the Church at home for aid. The war has unsettled and disorganized all the eleemosynary interests of the Church. The country is in a large degree impoverished, and unable to replenish the exhausted treasuries of benevolent associations. The slaveholders are complaining that they have been unjustly deprived of all their right of property in slaves, and will no longer feel it incumbent on them to support negro missions. In this state of things, if the colored people are left to depend upon the Southern Church hereafter to supply them with the Gospel, it will take

many years for that Church to come up to the measure of ability which she had before the war began, and in the meantime many tens of thousands must be left destitute. This destitution is already apparent; for while there seems to be a great effort to meet the emergencies of the hour, and nearly every conference shows, by its list of appointments, the connection of colored charges with the regular stations and circuits, "colored missions" are rapidly disappearing from the Minutes. Let no one be deceived or misled by this great array of "colored charges" in the lists of appointments. They are not, in fact, new "charges," but the very same that the ministers on most of those circuits and stations have been accustomed to serve, though formerly they were not named in the lists of appointments. Missions were formerly established, for the most part, in places that were not accessible to any of the station and circuit preachers. Where now are these two hundred and forty missions? Missionaries cannot live and preach to the poor for nothing, and exhausted missionary treasuries are not likely to furnish them with the means of support. It is very natural, therefore, that there should be a diminution of the "colored missions," notwithstanding the sudden multiplication of "colored charges."

This may be regarded as revealing the true *animus* of the Southern Church, not on the subject of slavery, nor as regards the negro in his new relations, but as regards missionaries from the North. It in effect says plainly to them, "Stay where you are, you are not needed here. We have always taken care of the negroes, and we are still able to do it. See how we *are* doing it, connecting with nearly every white charge a *colored* charge also." But does this meet the necessities of the case? By no means. If the Southern Church, if all the Southern Churches were twice as able as they were before the war, if they were all to redouble their diligence to elevate, educate, and Christianize the blacks, in their present circumstances there would still be left something for others to do; unoccupied space that they might come in and fill, waste places which they might come and build up, barren soil which they might cultivate and improve. Let them not stand back because they are not welcome to those who by their acts bid them stay away. There is a glorious work

for all the Christian people of this country to do. As to education, the Church, South, can do but little, and certainly manifests but little concern about it. Some of the conferences have ventured to pass resolutions recommending the establishment of negro schools, others have said nothing on the subject. Whoever will now come forth, and devote his time, talents, and energies to the task of elevating and enlightening this unfortunate people, in spite of the narrow prejudices of Southern Christians, in spite of hard speeches, sour looks, repulsive acts, and social proscription, will do more for the cause of truth and righteousness than those ministers and Churches that try to frown them off, and more for the real welfare of the South than those intensely *Southern men*, who, if they had it in their power, would blight its prospects by the restoration of slavery.

---

SUPPLEMENT BY THE EDITOR.

The present relations of the Southern Church to the colored race may be illustrated by the following documents of the late General Conference.

Of their MISSIONS AMONG THE NEGROES, Dr. Sehon, their able Missionary Secretary, thus reports:

Our missions among the people of color have to a great extent been suddenly interrupted. But we can but hope, from the present indications, the renewal of these missions, with the most gracious results. At no period in the history of the Methodist Church, South, has her position assumed a more commanding aspect in the world than at this moment, from her action in regard to the colored population of our country.

It is matter of just Christian pride that we witness the noble conduct of our several Annual Conferences on this subject. By resolutions adopted in every conference, they have determined to labor in the future, as in the past, for the moral and religious instruction of the colored people. This action is a noble defense of the Church, robbing our opponents of an argument which they were ready to wield against us, by asserting that our efforts in the past were directed wholly by motives of self-interest. We confidently believe that the course now being pursued will ultimately win back to our Churches and altars many who, for a while, may leave our communion. It will remain for this conference, with the best information before them, to devise the best and most effective means by which missionary labors may be secured to this people,

either under the control of the Parent Missionary Society, or those of the several Annual Conferences in whose bounds they may be found.

Of the CHURCHLY POSITION ASSIGNED TO THE COLORED RACE, that most liberal and progressive paper, the Southern Christian Advocate, Macon, Georgia, says:

Intelligence has reached this place of the action of the General Conference, establishing the Church relations of our colored membership. Beyond all question, it is the greatest and best thing that that body has yet accomplished. We are glad for the honor of our Church that it was enacted by a unanimous vote. We stand before the world with a Church constitution that accords to blacks and whites equal Church privileges, while by a happy and prudent separation it pays due respect to those mysterious antipathies which seem to be the indications of Heaven with regard to the two races. What are the provisions of our Church polity as now established? 1. Our colored members may be organized as separate pastoral charges wherever they desire it and their number may justify it; each charge having its own official members, and its own quarterly conference. 2. These quarterly conferences have the power to recommend members to be licensed to preach, to be ordained, etc., just as with the whites; the same examinations being held, and the same qualifications required in both cases. 3. These colored charges may be united into districts, under colored presiding elders; and if of sufficient number, being contiguous, or not too distant, may be gathered into annual conferences, under the presidency of our bishops, just as the white preachers. Finally, wherever their conferences are sufficiently numerous and organized, they may, *if they shall desire it*, have their own General Conference, and of course elect their own bishops, remaining in fraternal relation with us. This is all admirable, and proves that our Church and ministry are up with the times, and ready to enter the doors that Providence may open before them. O that God may shed upon our people everywhere the grace and wisdom rightly to adjust the varied and beautiful machinery herein provided for, and set it all agoing in harmonious action! Let our ministers throughout the length and breadth of the land take pains to explain it to our colored members; let them be assisted, counseled, and encouraged to erect themselves, as fast as prudence would dictate, into a co-ordinate and healthy department of our Church.

Of NEGRO EDUCATION the same paper says:

Nor has the action of our General Conference in reference to the colored people been confined to the guaranteeing to them equal Church membership and official privileges. Their intellectual wants came under notice, and they say not only that "*special* attention shall be given to Sunday-schools among the colored people," but they "*recommend the establishment of day-schools, under*

*proper regulations and trustworthy teachers, for the education of colored children.*" Here, then, is the official announcement of our ecclesiastical position on this subject. We not only permit, or connive at, (God forgive us for the past!) but we *recommend* schools for colored children. This is the fairest quartering on our escutcheon, and we proudly fling this banner to the breeze. Let our great-hearted people see to it that it is no empty boast, no dead-letter on our statute book. True, we are all bankrupt, and our white schools are nearly all disbanded or dismantled. Well, let them rise together, the white schools and the colored schools, all over the land. Here is the field for Christian beneficence. Enlightened patriots will cheer us on in a work that tends so decidedly to a solid national prosperity. But, as Christians, we have higher motives than patriotism or an enlightened self-love. These colored children have souls for which Christ died, and capacities for endless progress in knowledge and virtue. Some of the whites are poor enough, but all the blacks are poor; poor in property, poor in intelligence, poor in influence, poor in worldly thrift. Education is just what they want. Let us help them to it, and God will bless us in the deed.

P. S. Since the above was in type we learn that by subsequent action the General Conference has established fraternal relations with the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and has declared their entire willingness for the several congregations of our colored people to unite themselves unto that organization. Indeed it is the aim of both organizations to unite so far as the colored people are concerned. The very best of feeling prevails between them, and on the labors directed by such a spirit we may look for the richest blessings of the Head of the Church.

We may next furnish documents defining the present relations assumed by the AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH to the Southern Church. The bishops of said African Church approach the General Conference with the following profoundly reverent greeting:

*To the Right Rev. the Bishops and Rev. Clergy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Session at New Orleans, Louisiana:*

CHRISTIAN BRETHREN,—In the glorious name of the Lord Jesus we send you these presents, greeting. The business which we have now with you is to say:

1. That during the civil war, and since that event, thousands of persons, formerly members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have become members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and still desire to remain in our connection. 2. That in many of the towns and cities of the South are houses of worship, which were built, so we are informed, in some cases, wholly by the means of the colored people, and for their special use; in others, partly by the aid of the white members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, partly by the

aid of white friends of said Church, and partly by the means of the colored members of said Church, but still for the special use of said colored persons. But, be this true or not, 3. We earnestly desire to know *if arrangements can be made* by which the said properties can be peaceably and permanently transferred to the authorities of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America for the use of the persons named. We desire such arrangements for the following reasons:

*a.* We believe that Divine Providence has cast our lots with yours in the southern portion of the United States, that we are to be neighbors, living side by side with you *under the same state laws and under the same national laws.* *b.* That, therefore, it is meet and right that we seek peace, and cultivate it by all honorable means, namely, such as are dictated by Christian charity and Christian wisdom. c. Because we believe that we are providentially called to labor in the same region of country for the salvation of *all men*, but especially for the *enlightenment and Christianization of the needy freedmen*, in order that they may become *good citizens of this Republic*, and be prepared for the citizenship of heaven. *d.* Because we believe an arrangement of this kind would prevent all contentions in the community, and litigations in the civil courts.

To bring about and secure this oneness of spirit, this bond of peace, we are willing to accede to any proposition on your part which will not fetter or jeopardize our ecclesiastical freedom, nor conflict with the *principles of right*, EQUALITY, *and truth.* To represent us in your reverend assembly, we have appointed three of our ministers, namely, Rev. John Turner, Rev. Charles Burch, and Rev. Henry M. Turner. That wisdom from on high may direct your deliberations; that love and unity may characterize all of your doings, is the fervent prayer of your fellow-laborers in the great vineyard of our common Lord and Master,

DANIEL A. PAYNE, ALEXANDER W. WAYMAN, JABEZ P. CAMPBELL, *Bishops of African Methodist Episcopal Church.*

The following HISTORY of the AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH is furnished to the Conference by the above-named DELEGATES, and will interest our readers:

I. *The History and Progress of our Church.*—In 1787, seventy-nine years ago, the first move was made by the colored people of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to establish an independent Church, separate from the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1816 the African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America was fully and permanently organized, with Richard Allen its first bishop, who had been a slave of Benjamin Chew, by whom he, with his parents and three other children, was sold to Mr. Stokely, in the state of Delaware, near Dover, the capital town of that state. The number of bishops of our Church has been eight, three dead, five living. They were all slaves

except one. The traveling preachers at this time number about 550; local preachers, about 1,500; membership, about 80,000. Our Churches are located in every state of the United States of America. The value of our Church property, real and material, is $4,000,000.

II. *Educational Facilities.*—Day-schools and Sabbath-schools are organized in every episcopal district throughout the Union. The number of scholars in both classes of schools, under our jurisdiction, is about fifty or sixty thousand. The teachers are the best educated persons of our people, some thirty of them being regular graduates of some college institution in this and other countries. We have one regularly constituted college, the Wilberforce University, located sixty-two miles north of the city of Cincinnati, in the state of Ohio. We also have in contemplation the establishment of a theological seminary at no distant period, as provided for by the Annual Conference holden in this city last September. Our Church organ is the Christian Recorder, published weekly in the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, a paper which has been published for thirty-five years. Our Book Concern is located in the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and publishes our Disciplines and other religious books and periodicals. All of this work, the teaching of our schools and college, the editing of the paper and the publication of our books, is done by our own people.

III. *The Education of our Ministers and Bishops.*—One of the bishops is a collegiate and a doctor of divinity, made by the faculty of the Wilberforce University. Two are good and respectable English scholars, and the senior bishop, Rt. Rev. William Paul Quinn, who labored more than they all, in laying out the circuits, from Long Island to Missouri, establishing conferences, forming Churches, etc., is or has been the strongest man physically and mentally in our Church, and is usefully educated. Among the ministers there are six regular graduates and one doctor of divinity, made by the Heidelburg University in Germany. One is a linguist, being familiarly acquainted with eight languages, ancient and modern. The younger ministers are men of close reading habits, and many of them are collegiates. The contemplated seminary is designed especially for training young men for the ministry.

IV. *Where the most of our Church Members are Located.*—From the beginning of our existence as a Church about seven-eighths of the membership have lived south of Mason and Dixon's line, and the same proportion of the ministers. Four of the bishops now living, and the three who are dead, were born south of that line. So that we are at home in the South, on our own native soil, where our fathers and mothers have lived and died. It is therefore natural that our Church should desire to gather her children in the South, "as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings."

V. *Annual Conferences and Districts.*—Our Annual Conferences which embrace the territory South are the following: 1. The Baltimore Annual Conference embraces Maryland, District of

Columbia, and East Virginia. 2. The Missouri Conference, West Kentucky, Missouri, West Tennessee, and Kansas. 3. Louisiana Conference includes Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Alabama, Texas, and Florida. 4. The South Carolina Conference includes North and South Carolina, and Georgia. This last conference has been organized since the sitting of our last General Conference, which accounts for its not appearing in our new Discipline.

THE OBJECT OF THEIR MISSION.

The object of our mission to this General Conference is, to respectfully and fraternally solicit your sacred body, if it may please you, to make provision, by law or resolutions, for the transfer of any and all those colored congregations, and their Church property, who may at any time in the future voluntarily desire to connect themselves with the African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and who at present hold their connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. And also, for the transfer to colored trustees of the *deeds* of those congregations which have already united with the African Methodist Episcopal Church, but have not yet obtained title *deeds* for their property. A number of congregations in various localities in the South have united with said African Methodist Episcopal Church, and in every instance have left their Church property behind them. The white trustees who hold their *deeds*, as it is very prudent in them, not to transfer the deeds to colored trustees till this General Conference shall authorize them to do so.

Two things are natural to the colored Christians belonging to the Church, South:

1. It is very *natural* that they, having been converted to the faith of the Gospel and brought into the Christian Church by the ministry and agency of the preachers and people South, nurtured up in the knowledge of Christ and his word, their property bought, and secured to them by the same agency referred to, should have, many of them, *a strange desire to remain in connection with the Church, South.*

2. It is also equally *natural* that they, having a knowledge of the existence of a colored denomination, with its colored bishops, preachers, conferences annual and general, schools, colleges, a *book concern*, and religious papers, edited and published by colored men, books made and printed, and possessing intelligence enough to conduct a great Church government fifty years and more, *should desire to connect themselves with such a body of their own race.*

3. But, negatively, it is not natural that the colored Christians South, in view of the circumstances referred to above, should desire to unite themselves with the Church, North, the main body of which is in the northern states, while they themselves were born and raised in the South, and especially so when THE NORTH CHURCH SEEKS THEM ONLY, TO INCREASE THEIR OWN NUMBERS AND TO ADD TO THEIR FINANCIAL INTERESTS. This seems unnatural.

We would say in conclusion, that as our own labors here, in the South, will be on the same territory, in the same towns and cities, we pray that we may not "fall out by the way," but cultivate at all times and in all places that fraternal feeling which will bring glory to God and good to his Church and his people. Then the Church in this section of the country shall blossom as the rose, and the hill-tops and the valleys shall resound with the praises of our common Lord and Master.

JOHN TURNER, CHARLES BURCH, M. M. CLARK, M. D., *Delegates.*

The final COMPLIMENTS to the Southern Church and THEIR FREE OPINION OF THE NORTHERN CHURCH:

WHEREAS we, the delegates in attendance at the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, deem it of vital importance to express to the said General Conference, in behalf of our bishops, ministers, and people, our sincere thanks and gratitude to the bishops and clergymen of the General Conference for the very warm and Christian reception we have met with in said conference; therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That we do most cordially reciprocate the feelings expressed to us by the bishops and brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

2. *Resolved*, That it shall ever be our most earnest endeavor to perpetuate that reciprocity of Christian and fraternal feeling here begun.

3. *Resolved*, That *we believe it is the manifest design of the agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, to absorb the African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, the colored Churches under the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and ultimately to annihilate the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as to its distinctive organization.*

4. *Resolved*, That it is vitally important that *we unite in an unbroken phalanx to oppose, by all Christian and prudent means, the aggressions now being made upon us both by the accredited agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North.*

JOHN TURNER, CHARLES BURCH, M. M. CLARK, M. D., *Delegates.*

The "net result" of all the above may be thus stated:

1. With all our eloquent philanthropy toward the colored race, by the testimony of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, our only object is the "disintegration" of others and the increase of our own wealth and power by "numbers." Our advocacy of negro equality and promiscuous association is held to be a "trap" wherewith to catch Afric-America. On the other hand, by the same testimony, the Church, South, is a venerable body whom they approach with heartfelt rev-

erence, and under whose protection they safely confide without need of a "Civil Rights Bill," unless it be to protect them them from the Church, North. Christian candor obliges us to say that this gives a very encouraging view, on the very best testimony, so far as it goes, of the non-necessity of any special guardianship of Southern negro rights. These negro brethren look south rather than north for protection. It is a peculiar and somewhat unexpected certificate in behalf of the humanity and trustworthiness of Southern white Methodism.

2. We are furnished with a very unique testimony, that just so far as the colored race advances in education, self-respect, and independence, it *asks for a friendly distance between itself and the white race!* Our negro brother then turns up what nose he has at the declamations about *caste*, and turns his back upon the declaimers, and his face toward his brother ebons. He claims that his negro brethren, when sufficiently numerous and powerful, should be allowed to develop themselves, and to act out of the presence, and independent of the control or co-operation, of the superior race; and he asks what, in our opinion, may be often rightest and best. He says it is "natural;" and we think he is correct, if we hold "natural" to signify that æsthetic taste superinduced upon our primitive nature by the physiological variations of race. Beyond all reasonable question there is in each race, we will not say "antipathy" to the other, but a spontaneous preference for its own color, which is a rightful basis not for slavery or inequality, but for a *social separateness* which is not justly or truthfully called *caste*. Each of the two colors, equally and alike, feels this natural self-preference. Were both colors in this country absolutely equal in numbers and in every point of power and respectability, and perfectly friendly to and on a level with each other, yet each would by spontaneous affinity gravitate to its own, and a perfectly Christian and amicable distinctness, without *caste*, would exist. The philosophy, or the religion, which overlooks this truth will make a fool of itself.

3. Southern white Methodism is, or seems to think that it is, going to the work of negro education with all its might. We think the expression too general, too earnest, and too repeated, to be insincere or merely competitive. And in spite of the anti-educational laws that formed one of the damning disgraces of

the accursed old slavery system, the record of the Southern Church, as Mr. Caldwell shows, is in keeping with its present progressive position. Southern Methodism we have before said, and we may safely repeat, is and has been *the best southern friend of the negro.* Southern black Methodism, while repudiating promiscuous association of the two races, claims the Church, South, to be a better friend than Northern Methodism. Now we think it would be becoming in us, instead of ignoring or destroying such a Church, rather to aid its poverty in its labors for negro education. If upon proper examination these labors are based upon right principles and prosecuted with probably best success, northern wealth ought, even while pressing them with a quickening competition, rather to endow their treasury and energize their work, than to disintegrate, disparage, or grudgingly acknowledge them.

4. Some complications there appear to be touching Church property, in regard to which we need further facts before we make any remarks. The final words, and all the words, between the parties appear to be amicable.

---

## Art. VII.—THE NEW YORK EAST CONFERENCE AND THE SOUTHERN GENERAL CONFERENCE.

The session of the New York East Conference at Brooklyn, in 1866, will be marked in our history as furnishing the first interchange of courtesies between our two ecclesiastical bodies of Northern and Southern Methodism since the memorable separation in 1844. Obliged to be absent the first day, the writer of this article, in view of the distance of our next General Conference, from which alone any proper proposition of churchly recognition should come, bethought himself whether at least some Christian courtesy extended to the Southern General Conference now in session might not be a happy initiation. As the matter required instant action, and he had no one of his conference with whom to advise, he drew up in his own study, without consulting or having consulted on the subject with any human being, the telegram which, without alteration of a single syllable, was finally sent. On the second day

of the Conference he presented the document, (seconded by Secretary Woodruff,) and when he presented it no one in the conference but the seconder and the copyist of the resolution knew for what purpose he rose, any more than the members of the Southern General Conference. In particular let us note that no bishop was ever consulted by us; nor did we know at the moment whether our views in the Quarterly or the sentiment of the telegram were approved or condemned by any or all the bishops on the bench. And these details will, we trust, disperse a thousand cobwebs from the brains of our Southern friends about "traps," "policy," "duplicity," etc. If there was any trap or policy about it, it is entirely of our own personal invention, and we, and we alone, know all or anything about it. And if our assertion, made thus publicly at the risk of exposure if untrue, is worth anything, the only trap was a purpose to initiate mutual peace, by mutual prayer, between two separate Churches and separate sections of country. Our own humble consciousness before God is, that seldom or never was a nobler or holier object prosecuted with purer or simpler aims.

Although confident of the support of a number of our old antislavery brethren, (yclept "radicals" by our Southern friends,) we had not the slightest conception in presenting the resolutions whether we should be voted up or voted down. For four Quarterlies past we had pressed our own views, little cheered by the countenance of our editorial brethren, and opposed by the rare skill and ability of the editor of our New York Advocate. On the other hand we had so lately as our January Quarterly, published numerous extracts from southern bishops and editors, affirming the sentiment of "Peace and Loyalty;" the southern editors had pronounced our representation "a fair thing" and reaffirmed the sentiment; and although our brother of the Advocate repudiated the genuineness of that "loyalty," yet we did not see how it could be questioned without endangering the foundations of all social confidence. We had not the slightest misgiving, therefore, but that the proffer of concert-prayer for "peace" in the following overture would be heartily accepted:

*Whereas*, The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is now in session in the city of New Orleans; therefore,

*Resolved*, That we, the New York East Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, hereby present to that venerable representative body our Christian salutations, and cordially invite them, together with us, to make next Sabbath, April 8, 1866, a day of special prayer, both in private and in the public congregations, for the peace and unity of heart of our common country, and for the full restoration of Christian sympathy and love between the Churches, and especially between the different branches of Methodism within this nation; and upon the reception of an acceptable affirmative reply, this concert of prayer will be considered by this conference as adopted.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of this conference be requested to forthwith transmit by telegraph a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at New Orleans.

The mover of the Resolutions said, in a short speech, that this was *no motion for ecclesiastical reunion*. Were the question whether both Churches should be immediately reunited under one General Conference, he should *promptly give his vote in the negative*. It was simply a call to united *prayer* for divine pardon and direction.

The movement was opposed by Dr. Curry on the grounds that we had neither quarrel nor fraternity with the Church South, and that the General Conference had years ago wisely and authoritatively rejected all such fraternity. To this Dr. Crooks conclusively replied, by reading the invitation by the General Conference to all the branches of Methodism to unite in the great Centenary, and quoting the peaceful passage of the bishops' late address to show that the position of our Church toward Southern Methodism was not quite unchanged by the disappearance of slavery and the return of peace. We may add that our General Conference centennial invitation was, in fact, *the very thing our telegram proposed*, namely, *an offer for concert-prayer and thanksgiving*. The result was that the opposition was overthrown by a vote of eighty to eight.

The telegram was sent, and the days of expectation passed without a receipt of response. Not until Saturday, after the conference week's work was done and conference had dispersed, did Secretary Woodruff receive at his home the return telegram of acceptance from the Conference South. Taking counsel with the bishop, that he might act with grave and

due authority, he sent on SABBATH morning the intelligence (not a copy of the telegram itself) to the different Methodist Churches of Brooklyn and New York. THE CONCERT OF PRAYER WAS HELD. The Church in which it is our individual habit to worship did not have the announcement until the evening service. Full and fervent was the supplication that fulfilled this holy covenant of prayer. Refreshing to the hearts of thousands was the thought, that upon this blessed Sabbath concerted prayer was going up from the metropolis of the North and of the South, between the ministry and the membership of a Church long estranged in feeling, with an estrangement intensified by all the horrors of civil war. O holy truce of God! Why, we asked our own heart, should the blessed unison thus beautifully initiated stop here? Not doubting that the southern acceptance of our proposition was perfectly satisfactory, we took up a *new thought.* Since these two conferences of ministers and these congregations have thus harmonized and humbled their hearts before God in prayer for peace and oneness, why may we not request *the bishops of both sections to inaugurate a* NEW MOVEMENT, namely, *a* CONCERT *of prayer on some future Sabbath, in which* ALL THE CONGREGATIONS and ALL THE FAMILIES of Methodism throughout our land may unite?

In accordance with this purpose, we drew up in the stillness of our Sabbath night's study a second set of Resolutions, intending to offer them immediately after the reading of the telegram (which neither the conference nor we had seen or heard, though we had obeyed) on the morrow, Monday morning. When, then, on Monday, at ten o'clock, in the conference, we for the first time heard the telegram read, we were prepared for the further movement. As we listened to the Secretary's reading the response from the South to the conference, we noted, as we heard, that the telegram, in re-stating our invitation, *narrowed its grounds to Churchly unity alone.* But to our imperfect hearing the much later word *object* appeared to be *objects*, so that the ground still seemed duly covered.*

* It was in the following words: "WHEREAS, A telegram has been received from the Secretary of the New York East Conference, now in session in Brooklyn, New York, and addressed to the Secretary of this General Conference, respectfully inviting this body to meet with the conference aforesaid, on to-morrow, Sunday,

Accordingly we instantly presented the following resolutions:

WHEREAS, The interchange of Christian courtesies between the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has demonstrated the attainability of harmonious Christian action between our two Churches; therefore,

*Resolved*, That this New York East Conference respectfully requests the bishops of our two Churches concurrently to appoint some future Sabbath as a day of concert of prayer, public and private, in which they shall specially invite all the congregations, families, and individual members of both Churches, to unite, that God would pour out upon the people of all the sections of our country a more perfect spirit of love, confidence, mutual justice, and national union, than ever existed even in the most tranquil and united days of our great Republic; that he would shed abroad in the hearts of all Christians of all sections a spirit of harmony and peace with each other; and most especially that he would, by the blessed influence of his Holy Spirit upon all branches of American Methodism, lead us to a more pure and perfect unity than has ever existed in our past history.

*Resolved*, That in the concert of prayer, all the Methodist Churches of every name, section, or color, throughout our country, be cordially invited to join.

*Resolved*, That we request our Secretary to transmit a copy of these resolutions to the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and to present a copy to the presiding bishop of this conference, with the request of this conference, hereby made, that he would lay them before our bishops at the earliest period.

Note the difference, so confusing to our brethren South, between the *first* and this *second* proposition for concert-prayer. The first was transacted by, and limited to, the two conferences then in session. This second was suggested to the bishops of both Churches; it was to take place on some future Sabbath by those bishops to be selected; and it was designed to embrace ministry and people of all branches of Methodism. And

April 8th, in prayer to God for the restoration of Christian sympathy and love between the Churches, and especially between the different branches of Methodism in this country; therefore, *Resolved*, That the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, always ready to enter into any proposals looking to the cultivation of kind and brotherly relations with other branches of the common Methodism of the country, do hereby cordially agree to unite on to-morrow with the New York East Conference in special and solemn prayer, in private and public congregations, for the very desirable object expressed in the fraternal message of that conference.

let our earnest antislavery brethren *note that Ethiopia was specifically included.**

And now, could this additional movement have been inaugurated without impediment, how beautiful might have been the result. From the two Churches, covering the entire nation, the volume of united supplication would have ascended to God. Both Churches are sinners, repentant before God of all He sees to be sin; judged by God alone is the degree of sinfulness in each. How benign the result of such a prayer upon our national peace! That prayer is for the return of more than the happiest days of our Republic, of more than the purest days of our one Church. How very much of unholy feeling, of oppressive spirit, of factious strife, may have melted away during the hours of such a prayer. What presidents, and senates, and politicians cannot do—re-weld the nation's heart—a prayer-born, prayer-consecrated union, might do. But nothing of this was, alas! to be.

It is said that while the heart of the Church would accord with our views, the conscience of the Church is against them. How so? We find our views chording to the most earnest spirit of prayer. We feel them in unison with our highest moods of spirit. We can pray with heart and soul for the results at which these movements aim, namely, public repentance for the past, peace and purity for the future. Let others pray for "disintegration," "isolation," strife, and discord if they can; we pray for purity, peace, and unity. The opposite views appear to us not only hard, cold, and sullen, but unconscientious, prayerless, and godless. They refuse not only all mercy to the sinner before a formal display of his repentance; but, most un-Jesus-like, they withhold all goodness that would lead him to repentance.

The ambiguity of the responsive telegram, when publicly read on Monday, was, immediately after our resolutions were presented, readily noted by the sharper ear of the conference. The Resolutions, with the telegram, were consequently referred to a committee, consisting of Roche, Crooks, Curry, Miley, and

* To the Resolutions was subsequently appended, by way of amendment, a somewhat unnecessary *proviso*, that no disregard of freedmen was intended in the Resolutions! *Unnecessary* we call it; for we do not see how any disregard to freedmen's rights could be imagined in a call of both BLACK *and white* to prayer.

Whedon. And as the committee were named by the chair, Dr. Curry exclaimed, in a loud triumphant tone, "Let the committee particularly report whether the Southern Conference consented to pray for the peace of the country!"

The committee met in the afternoon and the telegram was examined. It bore by all consent but one interpretation. All reference to the "unity of heart of our country" was quietly scissored off! Was it done inadvertently? Every one of the committee (Dr. Curry being absent) would have been glad to think so. But the document was too elaborately worded, it was too complete in itself, to suppose that the omission was unintentional, or that the telegraph was responsible for the *hiatus*.

And now, after the fullest reconsideration, we say that there is not the slightest reason to believe that Dr. Wightman (by whom the response telegram was prepared before our telegram was presented to the Southern Conference) inadvertently overlooked one co-ordinate half of our proposition lying before his eyes. Whether the long period intervening between our sending the telegram and its presentation to the Southern Conference was there spent in consultation, or not, we know not; but the natural conjecture, subject to any contradiction from any authoritative source, is, that the hiatus was necessary in order to secure a unanimous response. Under the pressures to which they have been subjected for years by the dominant slave-power, our Southern brethren have felt it necessary to adopt (theoretically at least) the principle of total separation of religion from politics. Of this principle they make a special exhibition. And to our best judgment, it was thought best in this solemn transaction to furnish to their Northern brethren a delicate silent reminder that, unlike the Northern Church, the Church, South, is no political Church! And so, by a very curious contradiction, in order to avoid politics in religion, their very prayer is shaped by and to the principle of political secessionism!

Our telegram *had presented no political partisan clause;* no clause requiring them to become "Republican" or "Radical;" nothing more than the simplest and slightest expression of that doctrine of "peace and loyalty" which our January Quarterly had quoted as proclaimed by the Southern bishops and the Southern periodicals, in an article which the Southern press,

with a liberal and honorable unanimity, had pronounced to be a model of fairness in presenting their views.* Our telegram simply proposed prayer for the unity of heart of our common country, namely: that strifes and discords might cease, that peace and mutual love might prevail, that civil war might no more devastate, that future Bull Runs, Gettysburgs, Fort Lafayette imprisonments, and Andersonville starvation-pens, might never be. And that the Southern telegram ignored.†

Our committee plainly saw that it was out of the question upon a platform from which so essential a plank was subtracted to go before the conference or the Church with any proposition for the NEW *movement* of concert-prayer. Dr. Curry, at the head of his little phalanx of guerrillas, could sweep us with a besom. We were beaten. By what beaten? *By the failure of the Southern Conference frankly to sustain us at the critical point.* Had the men who framed that response but had the magnanimity to have nobly answered, not by long evasive circumlocution, but with a brief "Yes, brethren, we will pray with you for unity of heart both in Church and country," the sublime watchword of Peace would have rung from conference to conference along our North, and our future history would have felt the impulse of the movement. That sad falter of the Southern hand let go the golden opportunity which years may not restore. The shame of the defeat, the indignation at the evasion on so solemn a subject, the reaction of public feeling, the gathering onset of opposition have all come in, and we pretend not to measure the disastrous result.

* The "Southern Christian Advocate," one of the most candid of Southern papers, says: "If Southern Methodists are to be invited to respond to Christian salutations, to have their political position criticised and misjudged from *what they do not say*, they will be careful how they respond to such calls hereafter." If, we reply, when a Northern Conference sends invitation to a Southern to unite in prayer for unity of country and Church, such is the Southern fear of politics as to dexterously shear off the prayer for country from their response, they may be well assured they will receive few telegrams.

† The New Orleans "Christian Advocate" wishes to know if the fact that they do pray for the President, the Government, and "all in authority," is not sufficient? Our reply is, that we had no proof to present to the New York East Conference that such prayer was offered. Nor does such information now received explain the purpose or no-purpose of the omission in the telegram. Let those who shared in framing that telegram frankly explain the facts as we frankly do on our side.

The Committee placed the matter in the hands of the present writer, with instructions to modify the resolutions and report them to a meeting of the Committee to be held next (Tuesday) morning half an hour before their presentation to the conference. On examination, accordingly, alone at evening, we found the instructions to modify utterly impracticable. Entirely on our own responsibility, therefore, we framed a *new report*, and as but one of the Committee met the writer, according to appointment, on the morrow, and he but reluctantly acquiesced in the report, the writer assumes all the credit or discredit.

The real question for the Committee was this: *Shall the new movement for the second concert-prayer proceed?* The discussion now had nothing to do with the Southern Conference; nor with our first action, any more than if it were at a subsequent conference. It was a discussion, now, within our own body. It was a discussion now as much in the presence of the free antislavery North, eyeing our movements with solicitude, as of the South. It was amply competent for us, therefore, to arrest our own further movement and assign the fundamental PRINCIPLE * on which we acted, without any proper discourtesy to the Southern Church. That principle was this: "We will join in any good prayer as far as it goes; but it is bootless to inaugurate or propose any NEW public concert-prayer which is liable to be responded to with a secession or disloyal reserve. Yet on this principle will we affirm ourselves to act with perfectly kindly feelings to the Southern Church, and with earnest prayer that her views may come right."

The report was presented on TUESDAY morning, (two days after the Sabbath of prayer,) at ten o'clock, as follows:

The Committee on our Relations with the Church, South, respectfully report:

On Thursday, the fifth of April, 1866, this conference telegraphed an invitation to the Southern General Conference to join us in a concert of prayer for unity of heart in our nation, and for harmony in our general Methodism. On Sunday the response arrived, and prayer was accordingly offered in such of our Churches as received the announcement. On Monday, resolutions were offered in con-

* And we might suppose that our assertion of this high *principle* at this critical moment might silence some of the everlasting chatter about our "lowering the standard of antislaveryism," etc., etc.

ference, proposing that a similar concert of prayer should be held by the entire ministry and laity of both Methodisms, by which was indicated the length to which this conference was inclined to go, provided it was sustained by the proper response from the South.

On examining the response received, however, we find by the most obvious interpretation that the Southern General Conference, to our great regret, limits the extension of the proposed prayer to religious harmony alone; thus tacitly declining any prayer with us for our national unity of heart. We suppose that most of us are willing to unite in any sincere prayer for good, as far as it goes; but we doubt whether this conference feels a very deep interest in elaborately establishing a concert of prayer with sister Churches who decline to pray for our national peace and concord. The net result of the whole is, that we stand justified as having sought a religious unity upon the common grounds of Church and country; that we have ascertained what is the difference between our two Methodisms, and that we know in what mainly consists the obstacle to our Churchly unity.

Your committee, nevertheless, would recommend that we cherish great forbearance and consideration for the wounded feelings of even Christian men in what they consider a conquered and humiliated condition. Tender dealing and generous advances, which in the weaker party may be felt degrading, may in the victor be magnanimity. Your committee, therefore, recommend to our editors, pastors, and people the cultivation of generous thoughts and forbearing language in regard to Southern Methodism. We conclude with offering the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That it be earnestly recommended to our ministry and membership, both in private and in our public congregation, to offer frequent and special prayer for the spiritual prosperity of our brethren in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and for their attainment of such a state of heart and mind, as that they can so harmonize with us as that outspoken loyalty, impartial justice to the oppressed, and equal rights for all our fellow-men, may become constituent parts of their religion.

When this report was presented Dr. Roche objected that the closing four lines would be offensive to the Southern Church. Dr. Curry, then taking that cue, by a brilliant transformation, suddenly revealed himself in the character of a guardian of the feelings of the Southern heart. He executed a masterly flank movement by denouncing the report as "conceived in an arrogant spirit," as "a taunt flung in the face of a defeated and humiliated people." We question not the momentary sincerity of this unprecedented throb of sympathy; but it much resembled

> The last, the first,
> The only *tear* that ever burst
> From Outilissi's soul; *

and the readers of the Advocate know how immediate and complete was their able editor's convalescence. As the matter had now become too complicated to occupy the further time of the conference, it was by a very unanimous vote laid upon the table. The opponents of the whole movement then made a small attempt at applause, not because the feelings of the Southern heart had by this action been rescued from insult, but because irreparable defeat and disaster had been thrown upon the whole cause of churchly conciliation.

No arrogant or insulting spirit pervades a syllable of that report; but a manly assertion, in the temper of profoundest kindness, of the only principles upon which courteous interchange can stand. The first paragraph simply recapitulates the facts as they had taken place. The second states the fatal omission, with the net result. The third asserts the duty of persistent Christian kindness. The concluding resolution, grounded on the refusal of the South to concur in prayer for the national unity of heart, states the just conclusion. If such prayer be by them banished and relegated to the sphere of POLITICS, then do we most earnestly pray that not only "*outspoken loyalty*," but "*impartial justice to the oppressed and equal rights for all our fellow-men, may become constituent parts of their* RELIGION." This conclusion does not charge that they possess not those virtues in their politics; it desiderates that they may be infused into their higher feelings.†

* Campbell's Gertrude of Wyoming.

† Dr. Deems, in the "Watchman," April 28, says, "Every possible obstruction is put by Northern men in the way of union, and *these measures are resorted to in order to create the impression that we are ugly and contumacious.*" To which we reply: 1. The history we have given of our own origination of these measures does, we hope, demonstrate the injustice of this gratuitous statement. 2. The North Church has never felt any sensitiveness upon the point of having rejected the last overture. Our Church rightly held and holds that while the Southern Church was maintaining the existence and power of slavery with no sign of cessation or improvement, they deserved no recognition; just as all branches of catholic Methodism, outside our country, hold. She publicly and proudly proclaims the fact. We have not the slightest inducement therefore to throw upon the South the *onus* of past or present disunion. 3. Any pretense upon our part that the southern telegram intentionally evaded the offer of prayer for the peace of the nation, if untrue, could be at once destroyed by an explicit declaration from Dr Wightman, or whoever framed

Our editorial brother of the Advocate (who in his previous editorial issue with us on this subject seems to have supposed himself to have everything his own way) was doubtless quite as surprised as we to find his position overthrown in his and our conference by a majority of ten to one, and then overthrown in the New York Conference with a *unanimity and a doxology!* It would be overthrown, we doubt not, with not much less momentum in every patronizing conference of the Advocate. And if we could clearly place it before the laity of our entire Church, (opposed as that laity is to slavery, secession, and every form of treason,) it would be overwhelmed with quite as handsome a proportion as in the New York East Conference. So little reality is there (since the cessation of *slavery*) in the hostility cherished in certain quarters between the two Churches! The Advocate is, in our firm opinion, in the happy predicament on this question that its editor is on one side and the main body of its readers on the other; the majority (in weight) being of course in such case on the side of the editor. So far as the New York East Conference is concerned, by Dr. Curry's own claim, the final report was laid on the table *in the interest of peace with the Southern Church*, he himself suicidally aiding *to strike down his own platform* of sternness. And we call the attention of both Churches to the fact, that however individuals may have stood, *every vote passed by the New York East Conference was in behalf of peace* and brotherly interchange.*

The action of the New York Conference more than sustained the action of its predecessor, but by a surplusage injudicious, perhaps, and premature. It proposed immediate measures for reunion. For reasons amply assigned by us in our very first treatment upon this subject (our notice of the New

the telegram, that the omission was unintentional; but *no authoritative denial has ever yet appeared.*

* The Richmond "Christian Advocate" thus fraternally and gladly greeted the first telegram: "It did, and does surprise us some, though very pleasantly, that a conference of the Northern Methodist Church should, at this early day, receive those resolutions so favorably, and pass them with so near an approach to unanimity. Well done for New York East Conference. We are delighted to find among you so many hearts beating in union with Dr. Whedon's. We have no doubt you all felt better for it, and we will guaranteo that multitudes of Southern Methodist preachers will feel as much better on account of it as you do. It is so much wiser and more Christian to love than to curse and quarrel."

England Conference Report one year ago) we think absolute reunion impracticable, or only supposable as a contingency in the distant future.*

* Our article was thus far in type when the "NEW ORLEANS ADVOCATE," Dr. Newman's paper, brought us the following very welcome announcement from Dr. WIGHTMAN and others: "Granting that the responsive telegram was susceptible of the interpretation which Dr. Whedon and others gave it, yet *we have authority for saying* that the omission of the 'country' was accidental rather than intentional. *Dr. Wightman, who prepared the telegram, has since assured us that he supposed that the "response covered the proposition," and* HE NOW DISCLAIMS ALL DESIGN OF INTENTIONALLY OMITTING THE 'NATION.' And Bishops Paine and Pierce have given us like assurances. They characterize the treatment their response received as a determination to 'smell treason.'"

That is precisely the disclaimer we have desiderated, and it *most happily* SETTLES THE QUESTION. It disperses the clouds and gives the clear sky. We cancel not our article thus far in type, but we mentally cancel all that assumes an intentional reserve in the response telegram.

Yet the two venerable Bishops Pierce and Paine, both loyal and true *conciliation* men, will, we doubt not, upon fuller information, change their opinion as to any "determination to smell treason." Note the following points: 1. That the telegram omitted all reference to the "country" is a matter not of *interpretation* but of FACT. Dr. Newman says: "Granting that the responsive telegram was susceptible of the *interpretation* that Dr. Whedon and others gave it . . ." But, Dr. Newman, it was susceptible of no other *interpretation*. It is, we repeat, not a matter of *interpretation* but of FACT. Our telegram made two propositions, namely, prayer for "country" and prayer for Church. And that the return telegram excluded all reference to "country" is, by any possible interpretation, ocularly, a *fixed fact*. Back of the *fact*, indeed, there lies the question of Dr. Wightman's *intention*. But our conference did not and could not have the intention before them. They only had the telegram, and that did exclude all reference to "country." Our conference then had but one legitimate conclusion possible. So much for the *fact;* and now for our *animus*. 2. As for the *animus* of the conference, we have already shown that however individuals stood, its every vote was given with an invariable fraternal feeling to the Southern Conference. Our conference could not know what was the nature of the non-political platform of the Southern Church. It only *knew* that the Southern telegram omitted all reference to "country;" and feeling that such an omission took out all basis for further action, it simply *took no further action*, without assigning cause. Nothing, certainly, could exhibit a clearer case of generous and unsuspicious temper. 3. As to Dr. Whedon, the hiatus in the telegram was evidently to him a most disastrous fact. Upon the perfectly unsuspecting assumption (before the reading) of the satisfactoriness of the Southern telegram, he had based advanced fraternal action, and the hiatus compelled him to take an ignominious back track. It overwhelmed him with defeat, from which he would gladly have escaped by "interpretation." Could he have had this "by authority" assurance from Dr. Wightman at the conference, or we might say at any time since conference, it would have lifted a mountain from his heart—as it does even now. His offensive "Report" was simply his mode of breasting the overwhelming *fact* with a firmness and a frank announcement of "principle" due to his own Christian manhood. That

We now may change the scene. How the Southern General Conference accepted the first telegram is thus narrated in the "New Orleans Advocate:"

This beautiful message was received in a manner that evinced the lingering of precious memories of a happier past, and of a sincere desire that brethren beloved, long separated by misunderstanding and prejudice, might again dwell together in unity. The Conference had been engaged during the morning in the discussion of important questions, and at noon Bishop Kavanaugh informed the Conference that an important telegram had been received, and requested the members to be seated. Dr. Summers, the secretary, then read the message amid respectful silence. The blessed effect of this fraternal greeting was well expressed by the appropriate response proposed by Dr. Wightman, and adopted by a rising vote. Such was the alacrity with which the Conference voted, that scarcely had the bishop put the motion when the members rose *en masse* to greet their brethren of the North.

This was indeed a moment of sunshine amid years of darkness. The speeches of the old warriors in the long battle, though containing, as was natural, some references to past feuds, and some tokens of sensibility to supposed recent injustices, were characterized by a genial warmth demonstrating that the hardest of hearts have their soft side. Some sparks of the long years of conflagration of conrse there were; but we envy not the diabolical spirit that, overlooking all else, selects these and tries to blow them to a blaze. Could but the right approach reach that soft religious side, and warm it to a richer and still more expanding glow; could but the confidence be restored of pur-

Report, in the circumstances, was true and *right;* we withhold all apology and stand by its every syllable. 4. Let the truth be frankly spoken. The entire blame rests on Dr. Wightman for a most enormous and disastrous oversight. Were we in his position we should think it due to our own magnanimity to say to our fellow-bishops, "Exonerate all others; let the whole responsibility rest where it belongs, upon my shoulders."

But let that pass. The painful misunderstanding, the clouds of mutual unjust distrust, the loss of impulse to union feeling, the temporary triumph of a malign antagonism, are past matters of irreparable regret. But the shade resting, from their telegram, over the loyalty of the Southern Conference, is happily dissipated. Many an unkindly accusation and embittered feeling may now disappear. And a still more truly ultimate "net result" of the whole matter is the conclusion that each side was better than the other's suspicions. Each was simple and sincere in his action. *The lesson for the future is a heartier mutual faith.* And *nota bene, we virtually now stand where we did on the bright morning when we would have offered our second Resolutions, inviting all American Methodists to bow in a unison of prayer for God's blessing upon our Republic and upon our Methodism!* HALLELUJAH! LET THE PRAYER ASCEND!

posed rectitude on each part, how might the angry spirit, the deep fixed prejudice, the inveterate maintenance of past wrong be melted away. We point to the eloquent periods of the fiery Marshall, to the softened tones of the great Southern leader of 1844, Dr. W. A. Smith, to the genial utterances of the large-hearted Sehon, and we note the earnest desire of all the speakers but one, that the vote should be prompt, rising, and unanimous. Sad that that *one* should be the son of the founder of New England Methodism, in whom even New England would gladly find, if possible, only causes for honor. Sad that he should have felt and expressed those low "mousing suspicions" of "trap" and "policy" in a movement as guileless and pure as human heart can be!* We expect never to see this class of men in a reunion Conference; but no one can read the discussion without feeling that there was in that body a very hearty and unanimous desire for cordial and brotherly relations with our Church, and an earnest purpose to show that desire in action. Such is the position to which the great and terrible cycle of twenty-two years since the great separation has brought us. May the two ensuing decades present scenes of purer peace and richer prosperity.

Upon the feelings of the General Conference, unpleasantly affected by the later "Report" in the New York East Conference, (utterly misstated in their New Orleans paper,) the telegram from the New York Conference came very fortunately as a soother. Dr. Newman says:

> Already not a little good has resulted from the dispatch so carefully drawn by Dr. Foster. The effect upon the delegates was

* We were for some time at a loss to guess what was the "policy" here apprehended. But we finally infer that there were two parties in the Conference. Dr. Lee's party said, "We dread these proffers of fraternity. When Dr. Curry talks of 'disintegration' it consolidates and builds us up, and we like it; but when Dr. Whedon talks of 'conciliation' it disintegrates and destroys us, and we hate it. Our true policy, therefore, is *separation*, 'isolation;' do not pray or parley with them." The other party said, "Let us act like Christian men, and we may safely trust the event with God." The former party have indeed a devilish path and a devilish work before them; consisting of hate, discord, vilification, ending, perhaps, in a second civil war. Before the other is the path of the just, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. If the motive on our side were mere "policy," Dr. Lee's course is for the other side the worst kind of "policy," and the surest policy to give our "policy" success. May God deliver us from a Church or a churchman full of "policy" but empty of love.

salutary. A candid review of the acts of the General Conference will prove how cautiously and judiciously that body moved. *The "extremists" met with a strong and persistent opposition. There was a disposition to avoid words and acts offensive to our Church.* Rev. Mr. Deitzler, a fraternal messenger, was not allowed to proceed in his abusive harangue on our ministers, and Dr. Marshall was called to order when he attempted to assail us for having occupied the churches of New Orleans. Dr. Curry and Dr. Eddy convey a false impression when they hold up Smith and Lee of Virginia, and Marshall of Mississippi, as the exponents of Southern Methodist sentiments. With equal propriety they might hold up Garrett Davis, of Kentucky, as the exponent of the sentiments of the United States Congress.

We think here is a moderation which our Northern Conferences, and especially our Northern editors, would do well to reciprocate. And this we firmly believe that a large share of the conferences, and especially of the PEOPLE of our Church, had their dumbness but a voice, *would* reciprocate.* If the two Churches have charges against each other, there is a better way than a lawless bandying them in conferences or papers, with mutual crimination and recrimination, each party ignoring its own misdoings and rejoicing in his opponents' assailable sin, with all the low rancor of "politics." Could we commit all our mutual complaints, criminations, and propositions to the calm, prayerful COUNCIL recommended in our Article in our last Quarterly, we think the whole controversy might be brought to at least a more intelligible position.

Let neither our Northern or Southern Methodism—not arrogantly, we trust, but frankly we say it—for a moment mistake us. No "conciliation" that we propose entitles either

* Eminently statesmanlike and Christianlike are the words of Dr. Reid (Western Advocate, May 9:) "All thought of a very early union of the bodies must be dismissed, though every lover of Christ and our country must, nevertheless, desire the event as soon as may be, and labor to that end. Let there be no needless criminations. Every man who truly 'accepts the situation,' should be himself accepted. For such the record of the past may be canceled. No Christian courtesies must be omitted. Conciliatory words may often be spoken, and kindly measures adopted. Never, however, can it be yielded that treason is other than a great crime, or slavery less than a great evil which it was the duty of the Church to aid in extirpating. Who admits that the appeal to arms has settled the perpetuity of our government and annihilated human bondage, and will cheerfully serve his God and preach the Gospel under such a state of things, is our brother in the ministry? He who waits to restore the old order must simply be watched with vigilance. The wrongs that from the beginning have been the nation's curse, can not be revived in any form, and the Union is indissoluble now and forever."

party to fear or to expect the slightest bating of our breath in the highest and most earnest maintenance of our old opinions. Our deep wish above all things is to express the exactest and most salutary truth, however unwelcome, or severe, in the most perfect fairness of temper and guarded courtesy of language. Our old opposition to slavery, as the enemy of both South and North; our stern assertion of the justice of the war that destroyed it; our claim that the negro, both North and South, should first be qualified by education and then enfranchised, we reassert in strongest terms. Whatever excuse honest sincerity may present as justification before God, we earnestly and firmly believe, that before the Constitution and the true laws of the land, secessionism is treason in theory, and secession is treason in act, liable, by legal judgment, to capital penalty.* We sincerely and uncompromisingly hold, too, that the Church is to the nation what the conscience is to the man—its moral monitor and guide; and that the true mission of the Church is to overrule even the "politics" of the country with the principles of Christianity and the laws of eternal truth and justice. Nor do we, nor can we, relax one particle of energy in pushing our own national Methodism southward wherever it can go advantageously to the cause of religion and without destroying a greater existing good. This we would do not to demolish, but to build; not to kill, but to make alive. The Methodist Episcopal Church will occupy the South, as surely as the South, white or black, shall need her. And the South *will need her* unless the South fully, unreservedly, and heartily accepts a free press, free discussion, free schools, a free pulpit, free soil, and free men.

* But we will hold no southerner a traitor who *ex animo* will address us with sentiments like the following: "It was not a war to overturn the system of government itself. It was a war of ideas; *a war of construction.*; *a war of interpretation;* not a war to destroy, but a war to vindicate. . . . You were but yesterday our enemies; henceforth we must be friends. A warrior race ourselves, we can but admire the valor with which you have defended the flag of our first love, and vindicated, in the cannon's mouth, the integrity of the Union. *Your interpretation of the old charter has prevailed.* We freely yield you the fruits of your triumph. We sought not to destroy Constitutional liberty, but to maintain it, as we understood it. The questions at issue between us are now *res judicata.* Let them never disturb our Union again." Address at Memphis by Gen. Sneed, (ex-confederate,) quoted approvingly by the Memphis Advocate. On the contrary, Alexander H. Stephens still maintains the *right*, but mere *inexpediency*, of secession. That we hold to be persistent doctrinal treason.

On the other hand it is clear that the very question of literal *slavery* has ceased to be a practical question.* Ten years hence it will be a mere ethical abstraction; a shadowy point mooted only among our college classes in moral philosophy over their books. About whatever else we quarrel and divide, that must disappear. Northern anathemas and unchurchings on that ground are already obsolescent, and will soon be out of date. Southern books in defense of slavery are already waste paper; and their writer's grandson will never boast of his grandfather's authorship. *Who knows but in the day of that grandson's manhood the Cotton States may be asserting ultra-unionism over some other discontented section, and the Episcopal Methodist Church be proclaiming trumpet-tongued her right of moral control over the politics of the country?* What the South more than the North now needs is *peace;* the soothing of old strifes; the dismissal of the false political guides that have ruined her; and the adoption of those principles that may tranquilize. *For her highest interest it is to furnish to the North just grounds of confidence that she renounces both rebellion and faction.* For the interest of all it is that the North, in whose possession is the control, should truly understand her, and equitably exercise the power. The South needs the revival and creation of industrial

* Our tardy prohibition of "slaveholding" in our General Rules is of slender value either as an honorable *record* or a churchly *test.* 1. Had we made the change in 1856, or even in 1860, there would have been some honor in the *record.* But to wait until slavery had received its death-blow and then cut it off, was simply "shooting a dead duck." It looks sadly as if our controlling power considered the terms of the kingdom of grace and glory to be changed by a political or military event. It seems quite as sadly like cowering before slavery while it was strong and menacing, and trampling upon it when it was weak and dead. The North Church hung on to slavery about as long as the South Church, with not a quarter of the same excuse. If "repentance" is called for by our Northern brethren, we think that both Churches had better (as our telegram suggested) go on their knees together and let God decide which is the greater sinner. Brethren of our Methodist Episcopal Church, let us repent of our persistent proslaveryism! 2. As a churchly *test,* we may say that with half as much inconsistency as our controlling power seems to have incurred, the whole Southern Church could come in under the General Rule. The reason is this: *Doctrines* must be believed; *Rules* must be obeyed. The South Church heartily believes our *doctrines;* and she can obey our *Rules.* The Rule against "slaveholding" she not only will but must obey, for the national Constitution makes disobedience to it impossible. For that matter then the South Church both believes our doctrines and keeps our rules. And she got rid of "slaveholding" about as quickly, and hardly less reluctantly, than we. Suppose both Churches join in a concert-prayer of repentance.

enterprise; the tranquillity that can invite the investment of outside capital and the incoming of a virtuous and industrious immigration; the extension of just and equal laws and impartial enfranchisement to all her sons; the establishment of educational and religious institutions, and the development, under a policy of freedom and regulated justice, of those wonderful resources which may put her on a new course of prosperity unknown and impossible to the old dynasty of slavery. To that career of freedom and that result of prosperity, the whole North, radical and conservative, would with one voice cheer and welcome her. And toward these results, if we rightly interpret the signs, the South is already slowly yet encouragingly tending.

And here is our reply to those one-idead philanthropists who tell us: "If you harmonize with the Church, South, you forsake the negro." Not so. We harmonize with the Church, South, for the benefit of the negro. They are virtually the worst enemies to the negro, who proclaim with a voice that rings through and maddens the South, that friendship for the negro is hostility to the Christian white South. To assert the rights of the negro, yet gain the hearts of the Church South, are two ideas that should blend into one. Our main, though not sole, remedy for our evils is CONCILIATION—*conciliation of both sections, and both races;* yet *conciliation* on the basis of that broad Christianity, embodied in the Golden Rule, which seeks to qualify every man for his rights and then gives his rights. There is work enough for all, all working together. And the truest, briefest, most effectual method to accomplish the vast complex work is the heartiest possible harmonization of all into a working *unit.*

Happily significant is the excision of the old affix "South," and the adoption of the name "Episcopal Methodist Church." It marks the wise abandonment of old sectionalism and an enlargement into a broad nationalism. It is the virtual, half unconscious renunciation of secessionism for the future, (however, as matter of pride it will be defended for the past,) and a pledge of perpetual unionism. As from their invasion of the North we fear no "disintegration," so if they will here gather a Church from the raw material of the wicked world, we would cheer them on, in no defiant spirit, to the shores of the great lakes. At

every great advance a narrowness, an insularity, or an *ism* would slough off. Second, the adoption of Lay Delegation is similarly a blessed advance from old exclusiveness toward individualism. It announces the demise of the spirit of the oligarchy, and nobly moves in the direction of that universal education and impartial enfranchisement which constitute the true modern democracy. Third comes the large concession of ecclesiastical rights to the colored race. In this direction, impelled not only by the awakened spirit of humanity, and by the spirit of the age, but by a pressing competition, they must rapidly onward. Finally, they commit themselves freely and boldly to negro education, religious and secular, Sabbath and week-day. Negro education will demand a periodical press, which will create a negro political power, from which political rights cannot forever be withheld. We could wish there had been frank loyalty enough to give public thanks to our beneficent government, especially our National Congress, for its care for the safety and the rights as well as aids to the education of the freedmen. And we think they might magnanimously have tendered their gratitude to the Christian liberality of the North in the much it has done for that needy class. We think they might well have uttered some bold and ringing rebukes upon the spirit of oppressive and murderous cruelty toward the colored race, exhibited, not, indeed, we believe, by the Christian and cultivated classes of the South, (however much it may result from the neglect of those classes to protect,) but by the lower and lowest strata of the Southern population. And, lastly, we think, in view of the vastness of the field and of the work, and of their own poverty by the terrible calamities of war, they might have courteously invited the Christian people of the North to aid in the education and the elevation of the colored race, cheerfully proffering their sympathy, protection, and cordial co-operation. Yet, without these doings, how wonderful and how cheering is the advance since the educating of a negro was a penal offense! Let us applaud and rejoice in what the Southern Conference has done, and patiently wait for its next quadrennial session to see how rightly and rapidly "the world moves." And in order to this blessed "net result," be it, in conclusion, hereby cordially and fraternally "*Resolved* that it be earnestly recommended to our ministry and membership,

both in private and in our public congregations, to offer frequent and special prayer for the spiritual prosperity of our brethren in the EPISCOPAL METHODIST CHURCH, and for their attainment of such a state of heart and mind, as that *outspoken loyalty, impartial justice to the oppressed, and equal rights for all our fellow-men, may become constituent parts of their religion.*"

## ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### PROTESTANTISM.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

COLENSO—SENTENCE OF EXCOMMUNICATION—LETTERS FROM THE BISHOP OF CAPETOWN TO ALL THE ANGLICAN BISHOPS OF THE WORLD—PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY.—In the last number of the Methodist Quarterly Review we continued the history of the Colenso case up to the beginning of the present year. The Metropolitan of Capetown had offered to Colenso to have the sentence of deposition revised either by the Archbishop of Canterbury, or by the Bishop of the United Church. As Colenso refused to avail himself of this offer, the metropolitan issued a formal sentence of excommunication, reading as follows:

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ—We, Robert, by divine permission, Metropolitan of the Church in the province of Capetown, in accordance with the decision of the bishops of the province, in synod assembled, do hereby, it being our office and our grief to do so, by the authority of Christ committed unto us, pass upon John William Colenso, D.D., the sentence of the greater excommunication, thereby separating him from the communion of the Church of Christ so long as he shall obstinately and impenitently persist in his heresy, and claim to exercise the office of a bishop within the province of Capetown. And we do hereby make known to the faithful in Christ, that, being thus excluded from all communion with the Church, he is, according to our Lord's command, and in conformity with the provisions of the XXXIIId of the Articles of Religion, "to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as a heathen man and publican." Matt. xviii, 17-18. Given under our hand and seal this 16th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1865. —R. CAPETOWN.

The sentence was read on Sunday, January 7, at the cathedral of the diocese at Maritzburg, at the early service. In the evening the dean of the cathedral appeared in the chancel before the bishop entered, and desired all Christians to depart; but no notice was taken of it by the adherents of Colenso, and the service conducted by the latter was continued as heretofore. The metropolitan communicated the sentence to the bishops of Great Britain, of the British Colonies, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, all of whom expressed a cordial approval of the measure.

An important discussion on the relation of Bishop Colenso to the Church of England took place at the session of the Convocation of Canterbury, which began on May 1, and sat for four days. The Archbishop of Canterbury had received letters from the Metropolitan of Capetown and the Dean of Maritzburg, asking in substance the following questions:

1. By the Metropolitan of Capetown: Whether the Church of England holds communion with Dr. Colenso and the heretical Church which he is seeking to establish in Natal, or whether it is in communion with the orthodox bishops who in synod declared him to be *ipso facto* excommunicated?

2. By the Dean of Maritzburg: Whether the acceptance of a new bishop on the part of the diocese of Natal, while Bishop Colenso still retains the letters patent of the crown, would in any way sever the diocese from the mother Church of England?

3. By the Dean of Maritzburg: Supposing the reply to the last question to be that they would not be in any way severed, what are the proper steps for

the diocese to take to obtain a new bishop?

The Bishop of Oxford was for answering these questions, all three, in a manly and hearty manner. So were the Bishops of Salisbury and Gloucester. But the Bishop of St. Asaph doubted whether it would be wise for them as a convocation to decide a matter of that sort. The Bishop of Llandaff found that all of the questions involved most important points of ecclesiastical law, which none but lawyers could solve. He confessed his utter inability to say what the law was, and any opinion he gave could not by any possibility be satisfactory to himself or of advantage to others. The Bishop of St. David's held exactly the same views. The Bishop of Lincoln thought an answer must be postponed to some future time, and the Convocation of York must be consulted, for there might be a diversity of opinion between the two provinces. The Bishop of Ely thought that haste in answering would be "very disastrous," and "might bring about the dissolution of the Church in South Africa altogether." The Bishop of Peterborough thought that as to whether Colenso was in communion with the Church of England or not "he (the Bishop of Peterborough) did not think there was anybody that was competent to give an authoritative answer on the subject." The Bishop of Oxford made a stinging speech on this astonishing series of discordant speeches, and seeing no probability of carrying his original motion, altered it to one requesting the archbishop to appoint a time when their lordships might more fully examine the question. This motion was carried.

ROMEWARD TENDENCIES — CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN ANGLICAN CLERGYMEN AND A ROMAN CARDINAL.—The most curious and advanced step which has ever yet been taken by the Romanizing party in the Church of England, is a letter addressed to Cardinal Patrizi, of Rome, on the subject of a union between the Anglican and the Roman Churches. This correspondence took place in 1865, but was not made public until the beginning of the current year. The letter (written in Latin) is signed by no less than one hundred and ninety-eight deans, canons, parish priests, and other priests of the Church of England, who call themselves "seekers after catholic unity," and it is addressed to the "Most Eminent and Reverend Father in Christ, the Lord Cardinal Patrizi."

The most noted peculiarities, which are an advance upon every thing that has passed before, occur in the first paragraph of the letter, which is as follows: "Most eminent Lord: We, the undersigned deans, canons, parish priests, and other priests of the Anglo-Roman-Catholic Church, vehemently longing for visible union between all parts of the Christian family, according to the will of Christ, have read with great sorrow your Eminence's letter to *all the bishops of England.*" Here is the startling statement that these Anglicans call themselves "The Anglo-*Roman*-Catholic Church," and not simply, as formerly, the Anglo-Catholic Church, and that they regard a papal letter, addressed by its author only to the bishops of the Roman communion, as addressed to *all* the *bishops* of England, thus formally recognizing the authority of the Papal See over the Anglican bishops.

The Anglican priest reminds his "Excellency," the Cardinal, of how much they have done to make the Church of England worthy of the communion with Rome. "Whatever," they say, "may have been less perfect in the faith of the flock in Divine worship and in ecclesiastical discipline, we have improved beyond our hope; and, not to be forgetful of other things, we have shown an amount of good-will towards the venerable Church of Rome which has rendered us suspected in the eyes of some."

The Cardinal, and with him the Roman authorities, felt, of course, immensely pleased with this unique address, although they could not so far deviate from the uniform rule of their Church as to hold out any hope of compliance with the request. In his reply, dated Nov. 3, 1865, the Cardinal salutes the petitioners as "worthy and very dear sirs," and he assures them that their professed sincerity of heart and honesty of words have inspired the "Sacred Congregation" with a most pleasing hope. He expresses the hope that they may at length arrive at true unity by understanding that they are divided and separated from the Chair of St. Peter. Their pretensions to the "Catholic" name he assures them are inadmissible. Their condition is described to them as "an inherited state of separation." The Cardinal concludes with the hope that they will "no longer hesitate to throw themselves into the

bosom of that Church which, by the confessions of the human race, from the Apostolic See through the succession of its bishops, while heretics have barked in vain, hath attained the pinnacle." Notwithstanding this refusal of recognition, the Romanizing party will not cease their efforts for bringing about a union, but they are reported to continue their correspondence with Rome. It is even rumored that one of the Anglican bishops takes part in this correspondence.

The practical innovations which the Romanizing party endeavors to introduce into the service of the Church are very numerous. One of their publications has for its avowed object to introduce the prayers of the Roman Missal into the communion service, accompanied by their respective ceremonies. The name of the book speaks for itself. It is the "Ritual of the Anglican Mass, with the Ritual of Holy Baptism and Vespers, and the Unction of the Sick, with the vestments and holy vessels," etc.

One of the most remarkable among these innovations has, however, recently proved an entire failure, the English Order of St. Benedict. Father Ignatius by his continuing sickness has been compelled to seek refuge in his father's house, and the Norwich monastery has been temporarily closed.

UNITARIANISM — CONFLICT BETWEEN THE CONSERVATIVE AND THE PROGRESSIVE ELEMENTS—ASCENDENCY OF THE LATTER. —The Unitarians of England, like those of the United States, have for some time been divided on the question, whether their religious denomination should continue as heretofore to demand an explicit belief in the divine mission of Christ as a term of membership. The Conservatives insist on it, while the Progressives demand for every member of the Union an unlimited freedom of belief. Last year the Progressive party in the British and Foreign Unitarian Association defeated a proposition, made by a conservative member, for defining their faith. At the annual meeting, held in London on May 23, the subject came up again. The Rev. Samuel Bache moved that Rule 1 of the Association, which affirmed that the Association was formed for the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad, be maintained in its original clearness and distinctness by the following addition: "The principles including the recognition of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as the only God, and the only proper object of religious worship, and also the recognition of the special divine mission, and authority as a religious teacher, of Jesus Christ himself." He said no difference of opinion originally existed with regard to the descriptive terms which designated Unitarian Christianity, nor was there any want of unanimity on the subject at the present day, except in a small section of the denomination, with which he could not conscientiously remain. If, as Mr. Bache thinks, the "liberals" constitute only a small section of the denomination, they again had, as last year, control of the annual meeting, which, upon motion of Sir John Bowring, adopted by a large majority the "previous question."

## FRANCE.

RATIONALISM — STEPS AGAINST THE RATIONALISTIC PARTY BY THE REFORMED CONSISTORY OF PARIS, AND BY THE ANNUAL PASTORAL CONFERENCES. —The contest between Rationalism and Orthodoxy, which for many years has been dividing the Protestant State Churches of France like those of every other European country, seems to have reached a crisis which may soon lead to the total expulsion or withdrawal of the Rationalistic party from the Church. The restrictive measures against the Rationalistic party began about a year and a half ago, when the Reformed Consistory of Paris refused to renew the license of M. Athanase Coquerel, jun., well known as one of the ablest writers of the party. M. Coquerel had for some time been the deputy of M. Martin Paschoud, the Rationalistic pastor of one of the churches in the city of Paris, who had been in office since 1836, but in consequence of ill health had been unable to perform his functions. The Consistory called upon M. Paschoud to appoint as his deputy another clergyman whose views and preaching were more in harmony with those of the Reformed Church. This M. Paschoud refused to do, and preferred to reassume the pastoral functions himself. As, however, old age and infirmity disabled him from discharging all the pastoral duties, the Consistory concluded to place him on the retired list, with a pension of six thousand francs. M. Paschoud rejected this arrangement, denying the right of the Consistory to remove him in this fashion,

and appealing from their decision to the Minister of Public Worship. The minister decided that the Consistory had not a right to act as they did. The latter therefore resolved to avail themselves of a right unquestionably belonging to them by the existing law, and to dismiss M. Paschoud. In a memorandum addressed to the minister they set forth at length the reasons for these new measures. M. Guizot, who is one of the lay members of the Consistory, (and far from having, as he has falsely been charged, any intention of joining the Church of Rome,) had a personal interview with the emperor, in order to prevail upon the latter to restore to the Reformed Church the right of self-government, and in particular the right of holding synod. It is understood that the request has been favorably entertained by the emperor, and that Guizot was promised that immediately after the adjournment of the legislative body an imperial decree, granting to the Reformed Church the desired rights, would be issued.

Still more important than this action of the Paris Consistory is that of the annual Pastoral Conferences. These conferences are meetings of Protestant preachers, assembling in April of every year, in Paris, for the discussion of theological and religious subjects. They are twofold: one, the National Conference, consisting exclusively of ministers of the two State Churches; and the other the General Conference, embracing the ministers of every Protestant denomination. Hitherto the Rationalistic party of the two State Churches has regularly been represented in each of these conferences, and they continued their connections with them, although for several years the majority has passed resolutions highly offensive to them. This year the National Conferences adopted the important resolution that "it recognizes as the basis of its deliberations, the supreme authority of the holy writ in matters of faith, and the Apostles' Creed as a *resumé* of the miraculous facts which are contained in it." As it is common in the congregations of the two State Churches to read the Apostles' Creed every Sunday, the conference thought that every sincere member of the two Churches could subscribe to the above resolutions. The General Pastoral Conference, on the other hand, which includes the representatives of denominations which do not practice the reading of the Apostles' Creed in the public service, deemed it best to declare their dissolution, and at once to reconstitute themselves on the basis above mentioned. In both conferences the resolutions were passed by a large majority, (in the National Conference by 112 against 36.) The Rationalists have now organized conferences of their own. The great significance of this separation lies in the position into which it forces the Rationalistic party. Hitherto they appeared as a school possessing in the Church equal rights with the Orthodox party; henceforth they are made to feel that they will only be tolerated as long as the State government withholds from the Church the right of enforcing her doctrinal standards.

## Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

A Roman Catholic work by Dr. Vosen, on Galilei, (*Galileo Galilei.* Frankfort, 1865,) is one of the many literary attempts which have recently been made by Roman Catholic scholars to explain away some of the blackest spots in the history of the Roman Popes. A review of the book in the *Year-Book of German Theology*, 1866, (ii. 27 s., p. 377 *seq.*,) conclusively proves that the whole book is a glaring distortion of historic truth, and that the author was entirely ignorant of the best recent books that have been written on the subject, and that establish all the main points in the history of Galilei, in a manner which no honest historian will ever be able to dispute. It is, in particular, shown that the Roman Inquisition did order Galilei to be tortured.

In addition to the many popular apologetical works which have recently been published in Germany, we must add one by Held, (Professor at the University of Breslau, formerly at Zurich,) containing sixteen lectures on the historical development and the lasting significance of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. Dr. Löcher, in the "Year-Book of Ger-

man Theology," recommends this book as one of the best of its class. (*Jesus der Christ.* Zurich, 1865.)

From one of the leaders of the German atheists, Ludwig Feuerbach, a new book has been published on "God, Freedom, and Immortality," from the standpoint of anthropology. (*Gottheit, etc.* Leipsic, 1866.) The author, who rejects religion as an illusion, is not on good terms with the new materialistic school, which rejects philosophy no less than theology.

The work of Keim (Professor in Zurich, one of the leaders of the school called by Strauss "The Half Ones") on "The Christ of History," (*Der Geschichtliche Christus.* Zurich, 1866.) has appeared in a third edition. Other new works on the same subject have been published by Laurent (*Der Historische Christus,* Berlin, 1866) and Beyschlag, (*Christologie des Neuen Testamentes.* Berlin 1866.)

## FRANCE.

Of the great work of E. de Pressensé on the Life of Christ (*Jesus Christ,* Paris, 1866) a second edition has been published. The work has already been translated into English, German, and Dutch.

A. Röttscher, a Roman Catholic priest, has recently published the first volume of a work on the "Dogmatic System of Martin Luther," (*Dr. M. Luther's Dogmatisches Lehrsystem, seine Entstehung und Würdigung.* Berlin, 1866.) It promises to be the largest and ablest work on the subject written from a Roman Catholic point of view.

We are indebted to Count Gobineau (formerly French Embassador at Teheran, and now at Athens) for one of the best works on the recent religious history of Asia. His work, which is entitled "*Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale,*" Paris, 1866, treats chiefly of the sect of the Bábis, which from 1847 to 1852 spread throughout Asia. Hitherto but little had been published (particularly in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländ Geselschaft,* vol. v, p. 384, Petermann, *Reisen in Orient,* vol. ii, p. 182, *seq.*, etc.) of this interesting sect, which threatened Persia with a political as well as a religious revolution. An introduction treats of the religious and moral character of the Asiatics, of the Persian Mohammedanism, of the origin and the substance of the Sheah as well as Sufism. The history of the Bábis is followed by a work by Alphonse Dantier on the Benedictine Monasteries of Italy, (*Les Monastères Benedictins d'Italie.* Paris, 1866, 2 vols.,) treating of its interesting subject more in the form of gossip than of history. One half of the work is devoted to Monte-Cassino.

A valuable work on "The Mystical Philosophy in France at the end of the Eighteenth Century," (*"La Philosophie Mystique en France,* Paris, 1866.) has recently been published by Ad. Franck, a Jewish writer of note. It forms part of the *Bibliothèque Philosophie,* several volumes of which have been noticed in former numbers of the Methodist Quarterly Review. After treating, in a preliminary chapter, of mysticism in general, and its relation to philosophy and religion, the author devotes particular attention to the mystical doctrines of San Martin. In an appendix he gives an extract from an unpublished work of another mystical writer, Martinez de Pasqualis, on the final restoration of all things.

Count de Falloux has published a new volume of Letters of Madame Swetchine, (*Lettres Inedites de Madame Swetchine,* Paris, 1866.) The first volumes of the collection were well received as an interesting contribution to the history of the neo-Catholic school in French literature. Among the correspondents of Madame Swetchine, noticed in the new volume, is M. de Tocqueville.

An interesting little book on the persecution of Protestants in France has been published by A. Coquerel, fils. (*Les Forçats pour la Foi.* Paris. 1866.)

The number of works called forth by Renau's Life of Jesus continues to be immense. During the first year following the publication of the work (July 1863 to July 1864) no less than two hundred and fourteen were counted. Among the numerous additions which have since been made to that list is one by the celebrated Emir of Algeria, Abd-el-Kader. When Renan was in the East, in 1864, he came to Damascus, where he received the hospitality of Abd-el-Kader. The conversation, carried on in Arabic, finally turned on Renan's work. "Have you read it?" asked Renan, somewhat surprised. Abd-el-Kader ordered the volume to be brought, and showed to his guest that he had not only read but annotated it. The fact is an interesting counterpart to the

work against Colenso, published some time ago in East India by a Mohammedan chief.

Among the new Roman Catholic works against Renan, one by Abbé Michan, with a new translation of the four Gospels and a learned commentary, is especially commended.

Guizot has published a new volume of his "Meditations," relating to the actual state of the Christian religion. (*Meditations sur l'Etat Actuel de la Religion Chretienne.* Paris, 1866.) The rumors circulated in the first month of the present year about a secession of Guizot from the Reformed Church to that of Rome, prove to be entirely unfounded. He remains, what he has been for many years, one of the most active champions of orthodox Protestantism.

A new life of Father Lacordaire, the most celebrated of all modern monks, has been published by Chocarne. (*Le R. P. Lacordaire: sa Vie Intime et Religieuse.* Paris, 1866.)

An important literary movement in France is the formation of a "National Society for a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the French Language." The imperfection of all the present translations is generally admitted. The most peculiar feature of the new society is the union of Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews for rendering the work as perfect as possible. It created general surprise to find among the founders and the leaders of the society a number of well known Roman Catholics, such as Father Gratry, Count Montalembert, Cauchy. It was, of course, to be expected that Rome would condemn this act of association with Protestants. The disapprobation soon pronounced against the scheme by a number of bishops and the pope, induced many of the Catholic members to withdraw; but some remain, and will co-operate with the Protestants and Jews for the accomplishment of the great work. At the first meeting of the society a remarkable address was delivered by Amedée Thierry, who presided. M. Thierry is a member of the Catholic Church, one of the greatest scholars of France, and a senator of the empire. The origin of the idea, we learn from this address, "belongs to a Protestant clergyman, Petavel, who has embraced it with the zeal and the conviction of an apostle. He has traveled through the whole length of France and the countries of the French language. He has preached. He has knocked at every door, and generous hearts have responded and the doors have been opened before him. Scholars of the highest rank, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish clergymen, as learned as devoted to their particular creeds, cordially received, encouraged, aided him." After the president, M. Petavel himself made a most interesting report upon the object of the society, and the means to carry it out. He referred to the new translations which have been undertaken in France during the last ten years. Abbé Glaire has undertaken a translation of the whole Bible with the approbation of the Holy Congregation of the Index. A society of ministers of the Reformed Church has embarked in the same enterprise. M. Wogue, professor of the Jewish college of Paris, zealously pursues his translation of the Pentateuch. A society reprints the translation of the Old Testament by M. Perret-Gentil, and that of the New Testament by M. Arnaud. The Society of Pastors and Professors of Geneva have charged M. Secoud, D. D., with translating the Old Testament. A learned canon, M. Bertrand, has undertaken the same task. The idea of M. Petavel is to unite the efforts of all the ablest biblical scholars, of the most learned Orientalists and of the most brilliant writers of France, in order to produce a translation as perfect as possible. The plan embraces the establishment of a periodical bulletin to give a regular account of the meetings, and of another journal, (*Revue Biblique,*) to publish the labors of the colaborers, with a blank margin for the notes of the revisers. M. Petavel refers to an interesting fact in the Russian Church. When the members of the Holy Synod, who live scattered in all parts of the empire, received by mail the printed bulletins of the draft of a new translation, they entered on a margin their remarks and sent the whole back to the central committee at St. Petersburgh. The adoption of a similar plan might secure the co-operation of the ablest men not only throughout France and Switzerland, but also in Italy, England, Holland, Prussia, Germany.

The plan of M. Petavel is almost sure not to find that general participation which its enthusiastic author has hoped and toiled for. The Roman Catholic Church

will never look favorably upon this enterprise, and her disapprobation will prevent the majority of Roman Catholic scholars from taking a part in the work. Nevertheless the labors of M. Petavel may yet prove the most powerful impulse given to the efforts for obtaining the best possible translation of the Bible into modern languages. It may lead to a combination of Roman Catholic theologians, of Protestant theologians, and of Jewish theologians, to aim separately at the accomplishment of the work; and the comparison of the labors of the three great associations may accomplish the object of M. Petavel even more successfully than the method he proposes. At all events, his plan—to unite and organize all the best talent and scholarship of a country for producing the best possible translation of the Bible—is worthy of all praise.

The second book of Renan's "History of the Origin of Christianity," containing the History of the Apostles, was published in April. (*Les Apôtres.* Paris, 1866.) It begins with the coming of the mourning Jewish women to the empty tomb in the garden by Golgotha, and goes on to the moment when Paul and Barnabas are setting out from the numerous Church first called Christian at Antioch, to convert the world. The principal themes of the first portion of the work are the resurrection of Jesus, his appearance to the disciples, the influence of the Holy Spirit, the gift of tongues, and the power of the Church. Next follows an account of the Church at Jerusalem, its first trial and conquests, and its social constitution. This leads the author to a study of the state of society in that time and country, the correlation of it to the Church, and the influence of each upon the other. We have seen it stated that the sale of this volume has fallen far below that of the first volume on the Life of Christ, and indeed far below the expectations of the publisher. Translations have, however, already been announced into most of the modern languages. With regard to the contents of his third volume, Renan says:

> In my third book I shall attempt to follow the traces of these bearers of good tidings by land and sea, in calm and storm, through good and evil days. I am eager to narrate this incomparable epopee, to depict those interminable routes, through Asia and Europe, along which they sowed the seeds of the Gospel—those ways they traversed so often in such diversity of circumstances. The great Christian Odyssey is about to begin. Already the apostolic bark spreads its sails; the wind is swelling, and only aspires to bear upon its wings the words of Jesus.

---

## Art. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

American Presbyterian and Theological Review. April, 1866. (New York.)—1. The Bible Idea of Truth, as Inseparable from the Divine Personality. 2. The Double Sense of Scripture. 3. The Ancient Catholic Liturgies. 4. Quatremere, the French Orientalist. 5. The Relation of Intuitions to Thought and Theology. 6. James iv, 5, in Connection with Genesis iv, 7. 7. The Political Situation.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, April, 1866. (Philadelphia.)—1. Bushnell on Vicarious Sacrifice. 2. The Samaritans, Ancient and Modern. 3. The Great Schools of England. 4. The Raising of Lazarus. 5. Dr. Spring's Reminiscences of his Life and Times.

Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1866. (Boston.)—1. History and Theology of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church. 2. Our Place in History. 3. The Study of English Literature. 4. The Catholic Apostolic Church. 5. Brucke's Physiology of Speech. 6. Regeneration the Work of God. 7. Martyrdom, in the Apocalypse.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, April, 1866. (Gettysburg.)—1. Ecclesia Lutherana. 2. The Human Elements Essential to a Successful Ministry. 3. Hymns for the Use of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. 4. Pre-Adamite Man. 5. The Discovery of the Law of Gravitation. 6. Lutheran Home Missions. 7. Louis Harms, of Hermannsburg.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, April, 1866. (Dover, N. H.)—1. History of the Erie Quarterly Meeting, New York. 2. Christian Citizenship. 3. An Open Door for the American Church. 4. The Ark of the Testimony, and its Appendages. 5. Antinomianism: the Germ, the Development, and the Fruit. 6. Missionary Enterprise. 7. Goodness and Severity; or, God's Government Defended. 8. The late Rev. Sargeant Shaw. 9. The Supernatural in Christianity.

New Englander, April, 1866. (New Haven.)—1. The New Era. 2. Systematic Training for the Ministry. 3. A Biographer at Work. 4. Review of Dr. Bushnell on "The Vicarious Sacrifice." 5. Review of Rev. Dr. Beardsley's "History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut." 6. Review of Mrs. L. H. Sigourney's "Letters of Life." 7. The Political Situation.

---

## *English Reviews.*

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, April, 1866. (London.) 1. The Ecumenical Councils. 2. Kurtz and Stewart on Sacrifice. 3. The Church and the French Revolution. 4. Political Economy and the Christian Ministry. 5. Horace Mann. 6. Literature of the Sabbath Question. 7. Geology: its Progress and Limits as a Science. 8. Archbishop Anders Sunesen: Schoolman, Statesman, and Ecclesiastic. 9. The Sensational Philosophy—Mr. J. S. Mill and Dr. M'Cosh.

British Quarterly Review, April, 1866. (London.)—1. Anglicanism and Romanism. 2. Praed and his Works. 3. Bradshaw. 4. Club Life and Society in London. 5. Peter the Great. 6. The Reformed Church of France. 7. The Rinderpest in Great Britain.

Christian Remembrancer, April, 1866. (London.) 1. The Apocrypha. 2. State Papers of the Reign of Henry VII. 3. Badham's Two Dialogues of Plato. 4. Berengar of Tours. 5. The Sister of Henri IV. 6. Tischendorf's Latest Editions of the Greek New Testament. 7. Father Ignatius, [Mr. George Spencer.] 8. The New Latin Prayer Book. 9. The late Mr. Robertson of Brighton.

Edinburgh Review, April, 1866. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Grote's Plato. 2. Musæ Britannicæ. 3. Water Supply. 4. Correspondence of Maria Antoinette. 5. The Irish Church. 6. Autobiography of Prince Charles of Hesse. 7. The Reconstruction of the American Union. 8. Diary of the Right Honorable W. Windham. 9. The Reform Debate.

Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, April, 1866. (London.) 1. Mr. J. S. Mill and the Inductive Origin of First Principles. 2. The Site of Sodom and Gomorrah. 3. The Historical Character of the Gospels tested by an Examination of their Contents. 4. Scripture Revelations on the Intermediate State of the Dead. 5. Eusebius of Cesarea on the Star. In Syriac Text. 6. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. 7. Protestantism in Scandinavia. 8. Inspiration and Revelation.

London Quarterly Review, April, 1866. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds. 2. The Judges of England. 3. The Children's Employment Commission. 4. The Science of Language.

5. Coal and Smoke. 6. The Early Irish Church. 7. Female Education. 8. Ecce Homo. 9. The Reform Bill.

North British Review, March, 1866. (New York, Reprint.) 1. Palgrave's Central Arabia. 2. A Jacobite Family. 3. Austria. 4. Faust: A Dramatic Poem, by Goethe. 5. "Ecce Homo" and Modern Skepticism. 6. The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson. 7. The Ecclesiastical Commission. 8. Reform and Political Parties.

Westminster Review, April, 1866. (New York: Reprint.) 1. Railway Reform. 2. The Royal Hospital of Bethlehem. 3. The Situation in Austria. 4. French Opinions of the English. 5. The United States Constitution and the Secessionists. 6. Paul Louis Courier. 7. Commons round London. 8. H. Taine on Art and Italy.

## *German Reviews.*

Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie, Year-Books for German Theology. 1866. I. 1. Rösch, The Birth-Year of Christ. 2. Planks, The Gods and the Religion of the Ancient Germans. 3. Croor, Monasticism in the Roman Catholic Church. 4. Palmer, The Peculiar Character of Evangelical Theology in Wurtemberg. 5. Laurent, Philemon of Laodikeia.

II. 1. Steitz, The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Greek Church. 2. Bobertag, The Idea of Religion. 3. Engelhardt, On Symbols and Figures. 4. Rösch, The Birth-Year of Christ. 5. Kluge, The meaning of ἀληθινόν.

Studien und Kritiken. Essays and Reviews. 1866. Third Number. 1. Steitz, The New Testament Idea of the Ministry of the Keys. 2. Diestel, Bible and Natural Science. 3. Riehm, Review of Schulz's Schopfangs Geschichte, (History of Creation.) 4. Weiss, Review of Schliermacher's Leben Jesu. 5. Jaub, Jung Stilling and his Significance for his Times.

Zeitschrift fur Historische Theologie, (Journal of Historical Theology.) 1866.—III. 1. Herzog, An important Document concerning the Introduction of the Reformation among the Waldensians. 2. Walte, Contribution to the Church History of Bremen at the time of the Reformation. 3. Biographical Remarks on Dr. Niedner. 4. Grote, Review of Dr. Spiegel's Hermann Bonnus.

In the first article Dr. Herzog publishes, with a brief preface, the reply from Martin Bucer to questions proposed to him by delegates of the Waldensians concerning the Reformation. The Waldensians in the French provinces of the Provence and the Dauphiné, on hearing of the great religious Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, sent in 1530 two ministers out of their midst in order to confer with some of the Reformers on their affairs. They visited in succession Nuremberg, Murten, Berne, Basel, Strasburg, and at the latter place handed to Bucer a letter of introduction from Œcolampadios. The conference with Bucer has latterly been but very imperfectly known, and the reply from Bucer is for the first time published in the above article. This

reply of Bucer had a great influence upon the religious views of the Waldensians. They divested themselves of the last remnant of Roman Catholic views and practices, which were still connected with their, on the whole, evangelical system.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal of Scientific Theolgy. 1866. First Number.) 1. HILGENFELD, Christianity and Modern Civilization. 2. LIPSIUS, The Pastor of Hermas and Montanism in Rome. 3. HILGENFELD, Mark between Matthew and Luke. 4. LEUZ, The Installation of Tielman Hesshus as Professor in Helmstadt. 5. HILGENFELD, Reply to Dr. Paul. 6. LIPSIUS, Reply to Dr. Tischendorf. 7. HILGENFELD, Reply to Dr. Keim.

The Journal of Scientific Theology, edited by Professor Hilgenfeld of Jena, is by far the ablest organ of the critical school which counts Strauss, T. C. Baur, and other well known opponents of evangelical Protestantism among its members and co-workers. Most of the leaders of the school who continue to hold a position as theological professors or clergymen in the Churches whose old doctrinal standards they are trying to overthrow, can no longer deny that the masses of the people who embrace their views become outspoken enemies of even the name of Christianity, and frequently of the very idea of religion. The question, therefore, begins to be very seriously discussed among them, whether the acceptance of the fundamental views of Strauss and his friends may be consistent with the continuance of Christianity as an established religion. Professor Hilgenfeld, in the first article of the above number of his "Journal," advocates this view. He reviews the works of Rothe and Strauss, both of whom agree in believing the educated classes of the German people to be mostly estranged from the Christian Church. Hilgenfeld goes so far as to express his opinion that the holding of all the views of Strauss, who not only denies a superhuman nature of Christ, but even his absolute superiority over other men, is by no means incompatible with membership in the Christian Church. He, on the contrary, already believes to see the dawning of a new era, in which those who now hate or attack the name of Christianity will fully reconcile themselves with the liberalized and thereby rejuvenated Christian Church.

## *French Reviews.*

REVUE CHRETIENNE.—*February*—1. ROSSEEUW ST. HILAIRE, Julius Cesar. 2. DELABORDE, A New Work on the Wars of Calvinism and of the League.

*March*—1. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, Francois I. and Melancthon. 2. KUHN. A New Work on Montaigne and Pascal. 3. DE GUERLE, On the Origin of Language.

*April*—1. SECRETAN, Independent Ethics. 2. FROSSARD, Father Lacordaire.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*February* 1.—2. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America. 3. CARO, The Philosophy of Goethe.

*February* 15.—1. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Eight Months in America. 3. ST. RENE TAILLANDIER, Charles of Hesse and the Freethinkers.

*March* 1.—2. TAINE, Italy and Italian Life. 5. RAYMOND, England in 1865 and the Seventh Parliament of Queen Victoria.

---

## ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*An Eirenicon:* In a Letter to the Author of the Christian Year. By E. B. PUSEY, D. D. 12mo., pp. 395. New York: Appleton & Co. 1866.

It will be remembered that a year or two back Dr. Pusey called upon the "Evangelicals" to unite with him in repelling the assaults made upon the common faith by the infidel set which has risen up in the Church of England. There was great rejoicing over this movement of his, on the part of true Protestants, both in Europe and America. It was thought that his heart, which had always been true, had clarified his intellect from the Romish mists which had darkened it for so many years, and that his old age would be spent in the true work of a Protestant minister, to which he had devoted himself in his youth by his ordination vows.

On the other hand, his Romanist friends were alarmed, if not offended. Those who, like Newman and Manning, had been taught by Dr. Pusey himself the principles which led them so directly to Rome, were especially touched by his course; and one of them, the newly consecrated Roman Catholic Bishop of Westminster, (Dr. Manning,) wrote and printed a letter to him, complaining of his course. Dr. Manning charged him with "drifting back from old moorings," and, in substance, with intellectual inconsistency, if not with moral tergiversation. He added to these personal accusations a series of charges against the Church of England.

The *Eirenicon* begins with a vindication, as against Dr. Manning, of Dr. Pusey's personal consistency. It effectually dissipates all delusion as to his going back to genuine Protestant ground. He admits his love for many of the Evangelicals, on the ground that "their faith is, on some points of doctrine, much truer than their words;" and admits fully that when occasion came, as in the recent Oxford struggles with infidelity, he acted with them. But he declares that he never united with them in any of those things which were not in accord-

ance with his own principles, and that this union, simply to resist inroads upon the common faith, involved no change whatever in his views as to the nature of the Church, or any "shifting of his ground" as to the Church Catholic. With Dissenters he says that he was never "brought in contact;" but he fears that these bodies "have lost much of the life which they originally carried with them from the Church, and which God the Holy Ghost has preserved in individuals among them." Very patronizingly he condescends to say that the body which has most life in it is the Wesleyan, and that for the simple reason that the "Wesleyan body was that which last and very slowly parted from the Church!"

Dr. Manning's charges against the Church of England are met in a less manly and successful way by Dr. Pusey than are those which concern his personal consistency. On some of the points he endeavors to show that the Romish view is really reconcilable with the standard of the Church of England; for instance, that the English Church does not *really* deny that there are seven sacraments in her XXVth Article, etc. One of the worst bits of special pleading that we have ever seen to come from a good man (as Dr. Pusey unquestionably is) is his reply to Dr. Manning's charge that the Church of England "imposes on its people a disbelief in transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the altar," that is, the Romish Mass. Any unsophisticated mind, knowing the history of the Church of England, would admit this "charge" at once; and all true Protestants would glory in admitting it, just as they would glory in admitting the "charge," if made by an infidel, that the Church believes in God or in Christ. But Dr. Pusey, whose mind is anything but unsophisticated, plays with the words of the Articles, talks of the Schoolmen, of "substance and of accidents," in the change of the bread and wine in the sacrament, and finds "a sense" in which the English Churchman can admit transubstantiation! As to the Mass, the case is worse still. One could hardly imagine stronger words than those of the XXXIst Article, namely, that "the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." But how easily can strong words be explained away! "The very strength of the expressions used of the 'sacrifice of the Masses,'" says Dr. Pusey, "the use of the plural, and the clause 'in the which it was commonly said,' show that what the article speaks of is *not* 'the Sacrifice of the Mass,' but the habit of trusting to the purchase of masses when dying, etc." What could Cranmer and the rest

of the Reformers have been at? How did it ever happen that "the Mass," went out of use in the Church of England? Dr. Pusey ends this singular piece of exegesis with the conclusion that, as to the Eucharist, the Church of England might be reconciled with the Church of Rome by explanation of the terms used. So, then, the noble army of English martyrs went to the stake, not for great principles, but simply for want of a doctor skilled in interpretation, to "explain the use of words" to them!

But the latter part of the book will be as unsatisfactory to Romanists as the former part is to Protestants. It treats the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the pope, and the current and apparently increasing Mariolatry of the Roman Church, with a severity that will be all the more felt because the language in which it is couched is that of warning and expostulation rather than of violent rebuke. Altogether, this last effort at "peace-making" on the part of Dr. Pusey will fare as badly as those of Dury and Calixtus in theology, and of the so-called "compromises" in politics. Instead of pointing Protestants and Romanists to the Church of England as "a means of restoring visible unity," its tendency will be to satisfy both that the position of that Church as a Church of "Compromise" is at bottom false and untenable. M.

---

*An Inquiry into the Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Church of Christ and the Gospel Ministry.* In four parts. Being a Complete Refutation of all Strange Notions and Sectarian Heresies on the Subject of the Church and Ministry. By Rev. R. Abbey, D. D. Edited by Thomas O. Summers, D. D. 12mo., pp. 432. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1860.

*The Church and Ministry:* A Lecture on the Relations which the Church and Ministry sustain to the Christian Religion. By Rev. R. Abbey, D. D. 24mo., pp. 305. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1860.

*The End of the Apostolic Succession.* A Debate between Messrs. Yerger and Smedes, Editors of the Vicksburg Church Herald, and Rev. R. Abbey, in which the High-Church Doctrine of a Chain of Successive Ordinations is clearly and specifically surrendered. Edited by Thomas O. Summers, D. D.

These volumes, sent to us by the respected author, bear a date and present an aspect which carry our mind, as it were, to "the years beyond the flood." They treat a controversy which, with us, has had a long slumber. They name a year when we stood on the brink of the greatest of civil wars. And the external style of the volumes attest that even then the blight of that institution which convulsed the South with war was deeply withering upon the arts of peace and the productions of intellect.

Dr. Abbey's work first named above treats at full length the subject of Churchly organization. His theory, in brief, is: "God established the Church in two general departments, namely, the ministry and the laity, these two being essential, and their relation answering generally to that of a shepherd and his flock; but that any orders, or offices, or division of duties in the ministry may be varied by circumstances, times, and places, and are not essential." A Church is simply a spontaneous aggregation of Christian believers, ordering themselves into such organic form as may best attain the ends of their own salvation and the universal spread of Christian holiness. This simple view dispenses with an immense amount of artificiality in theory, but leaves the sacramental host full freedom to marshal its forces to the highest advantage.

And this we personally think the true view. The grounds maintained by Dr. Bangs—that there were two orders, fundamentally required by God in his word, necessary to the very existence of a Church, and that the episcopal was distinctively a mere office—made us all Presbyterians, at the same time that it involved us in a helpless contradiction with our own disciplinary form of episcopal ordination. Dr. Abbey has stated the true ground, and elaborated it at greater length, and with more fullness, originality, and common sense, than any other author. His work, we may say, without indorsing every statement, is well worthy of consultation by all ministers or laymen whose minds are called to the investigation of the subject. Dr. Abbey's style is always clear, often forcible, and his style of investigation independent and suggestive.

The two lesser works touch with tact and skill upon subordinate parts of the subject. The "debate," though embarrassed with a great number of irrelevant incidentals, finds a completely vulnerable point in the prelatic argument.

---

*The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost;* Or, Reason and Revelation. By the Archbishop of Westminster, (Dr. Manning.) 12mo., pp. 274. New York: Appleton & Co. 1866.

Dr. Manning is well known as one of the ablest and most thoroughgoing of the Puseyite perverts from the Church of England to the Church of Rome. From the constitution of his mind he is a more decided and extreme partisan than Dr. Newman, and his greater obedience has secured him higher honors and rewards from the See of Rome. Newman's English and Protestant training will now and then assert its rights, even amid his strongest pleas for Rome, and he shows a manifest uneasiness in vindicating some of the

most revolting Romish usages, for example, Mariolatry. But Dr. Manning seems to boggle at nothing: Mariolatry, infallibility, and the temporal power of the pope, are as easily swallowed by him as transubstantiation. Not that he is more logical than Newman, but that he has less imagination and less personal vigor of character. But Manning's power as a writer, if not as a thinker, is unquestionable. The object of this book is to point out the relations of faith to knowledge. But faith, in Dr. Manning's sense, means submission to the pope. For he holds that the Holy Ghost resides in the Church, and especially and chiefly in the pope, the head of the Church, and that his decisions, therefore, constitute the infallible rule of faith. It is the old and exploded heresy of the spiritual supremacy of Rome, set forth in luminous language, and in form and illustration adapted to modern thought. It will hurt none who are acquainted with the Romish controversy and its history. M.

---

*The Living Temple;* or, Scriptural Views of the Church. By JOHN S. STONE, D.D. Griswold Lecture on the Divinity of the P. E. Church, 1 Philadelphia. 12mo., pp. 354. New York: Anson F. Randolph. 1866.

Dr. Stone's excellent volume is a very pleasing proof that American Protestant high churchery, the fantastic ape of Antichrist, does not quite absorb the entire body of the Episcopalian sect. It is gratifying to peruse a work so catholic in spirit, so pure in style, so scriptural in doctrine, so consonant with the principles of the best standards of the English Church at the age of the Reformation. We heartily recommend its perusal to our ministry, as they will find little in it to which they cannot subscribe, much which will inform the mind and warm the heart, and nothing that would very widely separate our two Churches were all the ministry of that Church like Dr. Stone. We hope that the time is coming when the balloony inflation which has filled the head of that Church, and made it the laughing-stock of American Protestantism, will at length subside, and allow it to stand on the level of common sense and common courtesy with its surrounding equals and superiors. It has had a long interval of playing fool. The present volume is done up in Mr. Randolph's beautiful style of workmanship.

---

*Coming to the King.* A book of Daily Devotions for Children. By GRACE WEBSTER HINSDALE. 48mo., pp. 114. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1866.

Mrs. Hinsdale has furnished a month of devotions for children; a work suggested by her maternal experience in teaching her

children the holy art of prayer. They furnish her answers to her kneeling child's question, "Mother, what shall I say?" They are beautiful answers; couched in pure and simple language, yet expressing a depth and fullness of devotion reaching the needs of every human soul, and worthy the strongest and maturest mind to utter.

For each day there are a hymn, a selection of Scripture passages, and a morning and evening prayer. And this we believe to furnish a true way of attractively training the child in the way of prayer to a life of piety. Such a child may never know when it was "converted." It may never have been unconverted; never at any moment of its existence a child of hell. The arrival of its probationary age may find it in the full-grown bloom of Christian life.

---

*Commentary on the Gospels.* Designed for Popular Use. By D. D. Whedon, D.D. Luke—John. 12mo., pp. 422. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

The Gospels being completed in two volumes, we hope in due season to embrace the entire New Testament in two more. And by the time that work is done we trust that, from arrangements already made, a Commentary on the Old Testament in uniform style will be ready to stand upon the same shelf.

A concise yet full commentary on the Bible will then be furnished from our Book Rooms, in a very handsome and convenient external form, equally suitable to the minister and the layman. *Full*, we say, for if any one should hereafter take the pains to compare, he may find that in *commentary proper*, clear from homiletics and other additional matter, these volumes will be found more *full* than Lange's large but valuable work.

A Question-Book on the first volume is in press, and it is hoped that Bible-classes will find a great help supplied.

---

*Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law.* By Edward Buck, of the Suffolk Bar. 12mo., pp. 310. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866.

The design of the author of this volume, as stated in the Preface, is "to collect and arrange in convenient form, for reference, the ecclesiastical laws of Massachusetts which lie scattered among the statistics and reports of the Commonwealth." It really does far more than this statement would lead one to expect. The material for a history of the connection of Church and State, and of the dissolution of that unnatural marriage, in New England, is to be found in this small but well-stored book. While the book has

special interest for Congregationalists, it will be not only interesting but useful to all students of general history. M.

---

*Herod Antipas:* Sequel to Herod the Great; with Passages from the Life of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph. Also Sketches of Contemporary History, including an Account of the Residence of Tiberias Cæsar on the island of Caprera. By WILLIAM M. WILLETT. 12mo., pp. 343. New York. 1866.

Both the "Herod the Great" and this "Herod Antipas" are very unique and interesting illustrations of the Gospel History. They are written in a clear, attractive style, with perhaps too diffuse dissertation, but with a very full statement of the facts of history surrounding our Lord's earthly life. The work should have been furnished with a map or two. Sunday-school libraries should be furnished with the book, and all Sunday-school pupils should read it.

---

*A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures:* Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students. By JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D., in connection with a Number of Eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, and Edited, with Additions Original and Selected, by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., in Connection with American Divines of Various Evangelical Denominations. Volume II of the New Testament: containing the Gospel according to Mark, and the Gospel according to Luke. 8vo., pp. 405. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

The present volume will be found, we think, to fully sustain the reputation of its predecessor.

---

*The Early Choice.* A Book for Daughters. By the late Rev. W. K. TWEEDIE, D.D. 12mo., pp. 378. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1866.

Beautiful thought in beautiful language; well worthy to be a manual of moral and religious study for every *daughter* in our land. The volume is finished externally in Poe & Hitchcock's fine style.

---

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*The Principles of Biology.* By HERBERT SPENCER. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 475. Appleton. 1866.

In a former number of our Quarterly we published an outline of Mr. Spencer's scheme of a universe, to be delineated in a series of volumes that would form in themselves a library. His first volume, entitled First Principles, furnished us his Cosmogony, together with the fundamental philosophy on which his whole system is based.

The present furnishes his Biology, or Science of Life. Next will follow his Psychology, or Science of Mind, and last his Ethics, or Science of Society and Morals. Mr. Spencer is a powerful thinker, a bold, graphic, elaborate writer, and withal a very constructive projector. For better or for worse, if life continue, he will have raised to his own memory a gigantic monument, and in all probability will leave his impress on a large share of the reflective mind of the age.

We have, in our previous notice, very concisely delineated his philosophy. His Cosmogony develops a universe, grounded in an Unknown Absolute which may or may not be an intelligent GOD, from causes, or rather conditions and laws. In the present volume (and the one to follow) he professes to show how existing forces and laws wind substances through all the intricacies and developments that mount up into what is called life. He professes to show how blind necessities elaborate the whole complex labyrinth of living existences. His psychology will show how physiology mounts into the sphere of sensation, and how the phenomena of thought and will naturally and necessarily arise. His ethics will finally show how all the laws of just human morals are deducible from considerations of earthly good. His plan is to show how the structure of philosophy is complete without admitting antecedent plan, creation, or God, any thing divine or supernal. In spite of his denials his is the philosophy of Comte, as well as the "natural selection" of Darwin. He acknowledges the aid of Huxley and Hooker, both disciples of Darwin, in his scientific elements. We reserve fuller comments for the appearance of the second volume on Biology.

---

*The Structure of Animal Life.* Six Lectures Delivered at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, in January and February, 1862, by LOUIS AGASSIZ, Professor of Zoology and Geology in the Lawrence Scientific School. 8vo., pp. 128. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

In the present volume Professor Agassiz unfolds for the popular mind the latest developments of zoological science, and exhibits their relations to religion. It has therefore to the general reader both a high scientific and moral value.

He gives first a clear view of the four great types upon which all living beings are respectively formed. He demonstrates from the coral formations the immense antiquity of life on earth. He traces the ascending gradations of animal existences, and shows how from the beginning man was the predestined ultimate. He refutes the doctrine of development, by showing that all four

types existed at the beginning; and that the present immense variety of forms could not be derived from a few primitives, inasmuch as the multiplicity of forms was as great in the earliest as in the latest period. Finally, he demonstrates the existence of mind in forming the structures of life, by showing with how mathematical a skill upon a few elemental principles a rich range of varieties is attained. It is utterly inconceivable that any thing but a geometrical intellect could have worked so profound a problem. There is a rare charm in the style of Agassiz. It possesses the peculiar simplicity of a great intellect, and you cannot help feeling that it is one of the purest and most benevolent of men that is dealing with you. How rich and wonderful is God's divine romance of nature! "Truth is strange, stranger than fiction."

---

*A Text-Book on Anatomy, Physiology, and Hygiene.* For the Use of Schools and Families. By JOHN C. DRAPER, M. D., Professor of Natural History and Physiology in the New York Free Academy, and Professor of Analytical Chemistry in the University of New York. With One Hundred and Seventy Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 300. New York: Harpers.

Professor (not John W.) Draper has here given us a work on the subjects named hardly surpassed for school and popular purposes. The plan of the work and the distribution of its parts are eminently judicious. His language is perfectly perspicuous; and aided by the excellent illustrations, upon a page allowing them to be of ample size, the subject is exhibited with a perfectly popular clearness. For our readers who desire a practical amount of knowledge in this department, upon the easiest terms and lightest labor, we can conceive nothing more suitable than this volume.

---

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*Four Years in the Old World:* Comprising the Travels, Incidents, and Evangelistic Labors of Dr. and Mrs. Palmer, in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. By the Author of "Way of Holiness," etc. Pp. 700. New York: Foster & Palmer, jun. 1866.

Dr. and Mrs. Palmer sailed from New York to Liverpool on June 4th, 1859, and reached their home again on October 19th, 1863. The intervening period was spent in the British Islands, chiefly in special revival services. This visit was made at the repeated solicitation of many friends in England, with whom Mrs. Palmer had been for some time in correspondence, among whom was the venerable Robert Young, and under the conviction that they were divinely "called" to that part of the world. The volume before

as is a pleasant record of much that was seen and done, and, as the preface truly says, "was written not with the studied carefulness calculated to commend it to even the justly critical." We regret this. The successes of the great cause ought to have been so recorded as to commend it to the "critical" and "fastidious" as well as to "indulgent friends." And Mrs. Palmer could have done it.

Many places of historic fame were visited, but none with more delight than those which are Methodistically historic. Thorough Methodist as she is, and well versed in early Methodist literature, Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, Bramwell, Mrs. Fletcher, and Mrs. Rogers are for her heroic names. Wesley's chapels, pewter collection plates, study-chair, and half-gallon teapot are of more value in her eyes than a score of cathedrals. City Road graveyard is more precious to her than Westminster Abbey. She rejoices over "Wesley's vine," which creeps up by his window at Oxford; admires the neatness of Fletcher's records upon parchment leaves during his long ministry at Madeley; writes at the desk where the Checks were written; and talks with Greensmith, whose eyes were suddenly healed while Bramwell prayed. Mrs. Fletcher's Testament she will part with only at death. Methodist relics are to her not mere curiosities, but links connecting her with the grand truths by which God has wrought.

In some threescore places where Dr. and Mrs. Palmer labored, the power of God was wonderfully displayed in the conversion of sinners and the entire sanctification of believers. For instance, seven hundred professed conversion at Penrith, nine hundred were added to Madeley Circuit, and a thousand at Liverpool. Their theory is, that a great amount of power lies dormant in the Church, which the baptism of fire quickens into life, and wherever a body of Christians awakes to prayer and personal effort for the salvation of men the Holy Spirit gives success. They regarded themselves therefore as mere helpers to the societies which they visited, and, pressed with invitations, early resolved to visit only those where the ministry and laity were willing to make all other things secondary to the work of God. The doctrines most constantly insisted upon were the old Wesleyan doctrines of the "Witness of the Spirit and Entire Sanctification." And God honored "the Methodist testimony," as Wesley styles it. In many towns all denominations shared in the gracious work. Independents, Churchmen, Baptists, Methodists, ministers and laymen, bowed at the same altar, and became witnesses of perfect love. When theaters are emptied, rumshops closed, policemen left idle, blas

phemers taught to pray, defrauders compelled to make restitution, and thousands of awakened souls made joyful in the Redeemer's love, the work must be confessed to be of God. W.

---

*The History of Henry the Fifth:* King of England, Lord of Ireland, and Heir of France. By GEORGE MAKEPEACE TOWLE, Author of "Glimpses of History." 8vo., pp. 473. New York: Daniel Appleton & Co. 1866.

All the qualities that romance loves to picture were combined in Henry Fifth of England as completely, perhaps as in any other human character; the perfection of manly grace and beauty, heroism, religion, nobleness, a crown. His father was a heroic usurper, his son lost the crown restored to its original line; his dynasty was a heroic episode, of which he was the culminating point. Mr. Towle, by a natural sympathy, is in love with his subject. He outlines the characters, colors the scenes, and narrates the events with a rich and animated style. There is not a book lately published over whose pages we have so pleasantly, for a few rapid hours, lived the life of a past age.

---

## *Politics, Law, and General Morals.*

*The Body Politic.* By WILLIAM H. BARNES. 12mo., pp. 309. Cincinnati and New York: Moore, Wilstach, & Baldwin. 1866.

Mr. Barnes, like Hurst and Haven, is one of our contributors, blooming and fruiting into authorship. The graceful essays which he has furnished to our Quarterly upon some of the most classic authors of English and American literature are themselves classic. His intellect is reflective, blending a due degree of imagination with a current of clear, calm, strong thought. His style is pure, lucid, fresh, sunny, abounding in graceful allusions and cheery imagery. He has no head (as page 165 shows) for abstruse metaphysics; but he is rich in a genial, practical philosophy, colored with a gentle fancy and warmed with a tender and hopeful humanity.

Mr. Barnes develops into full expansion the analogy between the individual and the nation, the *man* and the *republic*. He carries the analogy into minute details without complexity or tediousness, and evolves many a lesson. Those who would study political philosophy without overmuch weariness will find these pages at once attractive and instructive; and those who are called upon to discuss such topics before a popular audience will find them suggestive.

## *Miscellaneous.*

*A Memorial Record of the New York Branch of the United States Christian Commission.* Compiled under the direction of the Executive Committee. 8vo., pp. 103. New York: John A. Gray & Green. 1866.

A beautiful memento volume.

*Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries*, and of the Discovery of the Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa. 1858 and 1864. By DAVID and CHARLES LIVINGSTONE. Maps and Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 639. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*An Introduction to the Devotional Study of the Holy Scriptures.* By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Author of "Thoughts on Personal Religion." First American from the Seventh London Edition. 16mo. pp. 193. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

*Notes from the Plymouth Pulpit.* A Collection of Memorable Passages from the Discourses of Henry Ward Beecher. With a Sketch of Mr. Beecher and the Lecture Room. By AUGUSTA MOORE. 12mo., pp. 374. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*The Lost Tales of Miletus.* By the Rt. Hon. EDWARD BULWER LYTTON, Bart., M. P. 12mo., pp. 182. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*Battle Echoes;* or, Lessons from the War. By GEORGE B. IDE, D.D. 12mo., pp. 325. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard & Co. 1866.

*History of Frederick the Second, called Frederic the Great.* By THOMAS CARLYLE. In six volumes. Vol. VI. 12mo., pp. 607. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*A Text-Book of Physiology, for the Use of Schools and Colleges;* being an abridgment of the author's larger work on Human Physiology. By JOHN W. DRAPER. 100 wood engravings. 12mo., pp. 376.

*The Shadow of Christianity;* or, the Genesis of the Christian State. A Treatise for the Times. 12mo., pp. 167. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

*Cherry and Violet:* A Tale of the Great Plague. By the author of "Mary Powell." 12mo., pp. 239. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1866.

*The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, afterward Mistress Milton.* 12mo., pp. 271. New York: M. W. Dodd.

The last two are part of a series of interesting historic fictions, in course of publication, in beautiful style, by Mr. Dodd. The "Household of Sir Thomas More," and "Colloquies of Edward Osborn," form part of the same series.

*The Scriptural Law of Divorce.* By ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Newton Theological Institution. 24mo., pp. 82. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1866.

*The Idle Word:* Short Religious Essays upon the Gift of Speech and its Employment in Conversation. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, etc. 16mo., pp. 208. New York: Appletons. 1866.

*A Text-Book of Chemistry.* For the Use of Schools and Colleges. By HENRY DRAPER, Professor in the University of New York. 300 Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 507. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

# METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## OCTOBER, 1866.

### ART. I.—THE ORIGIN OF REVOLUTIONS IN PUBLIC OPINION.

*Social Statics;* or, The Conditions Essential to Human Happiness Specified, and the First of them Developed. By HERBERT SPENCER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1865.

*A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe.* By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M.D., LL.D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

*The Biographical History of Philosophy*, from its Origin in Greece down to the Present Day. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1857.

*Essays and Reviews.* [Particularly, Essays on "The Education of the World," by DR. ZEMPLE.] London: John W. Parker & Son. 1860.

WE have grouped these volumes together, and might have added the titles of other notable works, not to criticise them in detail, nor even to indicate their various sentiments, but simply to call attention to one doctrine which under various guises they all hold, namely, the bondage of man to circumstances, of matter to mind. With them souls, as bodies, are simply and only effects. History is an exact science; man is only a machine. It has become a favorite generalization of a class of thinkers, of late, to regard the whole world of man as an individual passing through several successive periods of development or character; from the ignorance and imbecility

of infancy, through the hopefulness and credulity of childhood, the passion and poetry of youth, to the sterner practical ambition of manhood, and the final positive convictions and well-defined knowledge and contented despair of old age. Whenever an hypothesis similar to this is entertained and elaborated by philosophers who disallow any information superior to the deductions of the human reason, the final stage of human development is depicted, not as an era of hopeful, joyous anticipation, but as a cold passionless reign of science, in which men shall have learned the power of all material and mental laws, and obeying them shall present what they deem a perfected manhood, which, like a perfected vegetation, shall pass through its appointed rounds and die away, without any hope or fear not necessary to its complete development in this, its only known existence.*

But others, who do not discard man's chief glory, his religious nature, and who accept the logical deduction that this nature proves the existence of the supersensual and the eternal, still adopt the generalization of the gradual growth of the race, but anticipate in the last era the co-reign of science and faith, both efficient and harmonious, and each with its well-defined powers, under whose joint domain man shall obey all the laws of the present life, and thereby become qualified for graduation into a higher order of existence.

All who entertain the idea of development, common to both of these parties, see in the history of man, already past, several successive stages, in each of which some one race has been dominant, and has gradually assumed the empire of the world.

During its infancy all its parts were in common growing, and a common credulousness appeared, like the blossoms of spring, beautiful, and often desired again when gone, but really fruitless, and to maturer minds insipid. The hopefulness of childhood too was universal in its reign, and spontaneous in its inception. But in manhood the races diverge in nature. The Hebrews, in the early manhood of the human race, taught the sublime doctrine of the unity of the Supreme Being, to all the world; the Greeks, in a maturer intellectual manhood, car-

* See the Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte, last chapter.

ried poetry and the love of the beautiful to a supreme place in the affections of the world; the Romans enthroned order; Christianity initiated the empire of love; while modern Europe presents man emancipated from the follies of youth and the ambition of early maturity, and has demonstrated the power of *science*, which promises in its reign to subject all other powers to its control and limit them to their just spheres; while America in particular claims the attention of the world by demonstrating that even the masses of mankind, hitherto regarded first as slaves, and next as helpless immortals to be protected, are really capable of self-government, self-purification, and growth.

Now whether this theory be regarded simply as a convenient hypothesis, by which the facts of history may be classified, or as a genuine expression of an actual law, though false, it may be convenient and useful to the honest student of history and man.

The theory also presupposes what we may concede to be an evident fact, that men have been accustomed to move in masses, not only literally and bodily, but mentally and morally. The history of the world is not the history of individuals, but of classes and of epochs. We are not dealing with imaginations, but with positive well-defined entities, when we speak of the Egyptian civilization, Babylonian and Persian despotism, the Grecian æsthetics and culture, the Macedonian ambition, the Roman order and imperiousness, (each for its time dominant in the civilized world,) the reconstruction of society by Christianity after the disintegration of the Roman empire, the gradual rising of the people into notice during the middle ages of Europe, the severe conflicts of thought in our own age: all these words express great, ponderous facts, and presuppose our common conviction that men move in masses—that either special thoughts, or passions, or habits, or some kinds of mental motive-power, obtain a supremacy for a time over a race, and often, sooner or later, over a large portion of the world. History is only instructive as it describes and accounts for these facts.

It does not fall within our purpose now to inquire whether any system can be detected in the *succession* of these great moral motors, indicating improvement, or reactions, or simply

repetitions in a stupendous cycle; nor whether we can detect in them any *plan*, or evidence of a control by an independent and supreme intellect and will. These inquiries, though, in our opinion, the sublimest of which the mind is capable, and not grasped in the conceptions of such men as Auguste Comte, and Lessing, and Herbert Spencer, are nevertheless too vast to be even fairly stated in a brief essay. We therefore select a single vein of thought, a central vein indeed in the great vital system of the universe, a correct perception of which would do much to prepare the mind for a proper view of the whole. We propose to inquire what causes special independent waves of public opinion, that sweep over large parts of the world, and give it character for successive epochs? Are these caused by human instincts?

The instincts of human beings are always the same. The limitations of their ability are the same. Their native physical, mental, and moral capacities vary within narrow limits. It is true that the character of one generation does modify even the instincts of their successors, and some tendencies, tastes, habits, and temperaments seem to be transmitted; but these influences are so irregular, capricious, and untraceable, as to lead such a man as Buckle hastily to deny them altogether;* and even if they be acknowledged, they could not account for sudden waves of public opinion and character, which have a distinctly marked genesis and exitus; and moreover, if acknowledged, an explanation of this origin is demanded, and the difficulty is only crowded one step further back.

Are these great people-and-age-characteristics the result mainly, or to any appreciable extent, of some newly created or newly operative material power? Does climate vary so as to change the nature of man? Is the planet on which we dwell growing smaller, or colder, or warmer, or more or less magnetic? Are the oceans and land displacing each other? Are volcanoes disappearing? Is the earth preparing for the maturization and extinction of the present race, and the introduction of a post-Adamic man? Is the sun feeling the effects of the high price of fuel, or has man, by his rash and foolish interference with nature, irrecoverably spoiled the earth as a place for human habitation? If it was "good" when created,

* Civilization in England, vol. i, p. 161.

is it evil now? Man has exterminated some animals and plants, and unduly increased the number and power of others; has he not destroyed the proper balance of things, and can it be restored?

Now that material powers do, to a certain extent, affect the character of man, no observing person can deny. But it is certain that they are not the chief elements in the causes of these successive epochs of peculiar public opinion, for these two reasons: First, the causes themselves are either constant, or their change is so slow as to be almost imperceptible. Second, the material changes are often detected, unattended by changes of opinion and character, which changes of opinion and character often arise without any known change in material circumstances.*

Macaulay asks, in his peculiar apothegmatic style, How can a people that eats potatoes contend with one that eats bread? To say nothing of the appeal to a vulgar prejudice rather than to science in the preference exhibited for a peculiar article of food, it would be impossible to trace any moral or mental characteristic prevailing in precise proportion with the growth and use of the potato; nor can it be shown that the introduction of this new esculent has affected the mental or moral, or even physical character of man. We might with as much propriety attribute the southern rebellion and the extinction of slavery to the use of tomatoes, since the agitation and discussion of slavery arose about the time men began to eat the tomato, and both practices have regularly increased together!

It is evident that rapidly, and in all parts of the world, irrespective of meteorological influences or any other material causes, there do spring up distinctly different faiths, impulses, passions, that often develop into religions or institutions, and organize men with more or less system into grand compound powers affecting other men, contending with other like organizations, modifying them, crushing them out, and stamping the character of their age.

These waves are not confined to any zone, or continent, or race of men. Dominancy is not the gift or characteristic of any particular place. Would we find its cause or causes we must look deeper than to configuration of the land, the char-

* See Grote's History of Greece, Part II, chapter i.

acter of the soil, or air, or food. There are some traditional notions on this subject that men have adopted without reflection, and often repeat, parrot-like, without thought. Much is said about the love of liberty begotten by mountain scenery, by men who seem to forget that the greatest blows tyranny has ever received in Europe were inflicted by the people who lived on the flat lands of Germany and the marshes of Holland, which were actually diked out from the ocean. Rocks and mountains are indeed natural defences against invasion; but the scattered people, who are compelled to be frugal while dwelling among them, have certainly, as often as their brethren on the plains and marshes, sold themselves for bread, and subjected themselves to the most degrading superstitions. It is not mountain, or valley, or ocean, or rivers, or soil, or air, that alone or together give origin to these changes in thought. The matter element in epoch-opinion is small. Facts compel us to recognize another agency, the original, mysterious, *creative* power of mind. Faiths, fears, hopes, imaginations, thoughts, do characterize men and ages. The old pyramids of Egypt are simply the dead remains of once vital science.* It was noble thought that the master builders endeavored to embody, as in the case of Solomon's temple. It was also a thought-power, that enabled the masters to control the muscles and minds of the tens of thousands of men who quarried those immense masses from the mountains of rock, and piled them up so skillfully as to resist time's ravages for thousands of years. The Nile still flows through the valley, and annually rises into flood and leaves its sediment on the soil as when those thousands of men toiled among the rocks. Nature is the same in all her powers, from the sun to the pebble, and men still live there — but no new pyramids are rising. Descendants of those old builders crowd around the pyramids like vermin, and have not sufficient energy to clear away the sands from their base. All is dull there. The great mental and moral phenomena of our day, for some reason, are working elsewhere. So Babylon, when it monopolized the labor of the world, and grew up, a stupendous rectangle of walls, with its hanging gardens, its Temple of Belus, and its magnificent parks, was the embodification of the *thought*

* See Blackwood's Magazine, vol. xciv, p. 347.

of some one or many, and remained long as the material exponent of a once vigorous and stupendous public opinion, long since passed away. Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, who slaughtered men as the gardener slaughters noxious insects in the spring, were the exhibitors of great world-moving ideas; Alexander and his hosts were illustrating a general race-thought; the Grecian philosophers and poets and orators were exhibiting the power of a national enthusiasm; Roman law is the creation of a persistent, all-controlling passion for order and supremacy. Christianity, Mohammedanism, the all-dominant power of Gregory XVIII., the Reformation of Luther, the army of cultivated devotees marshaled and controlled by the genius of Ignatius Loyola, the French Revolution, the modern missionary spirit, the great scientific and political and educational undertakings of the nineteenth century, are all outward expressions of inward vital and vitalizing general thoughts. Many men imbibe these thoughts by imitation. They fill the air. They spread from land to land, from race to race. They rage like a storm. They furrow the earth with marks that centuries cannot efface. They assume new types in different places. They pass over into other forms or die. How do they arise? What are the laws of their growth? Have they anything in common? Whither do they tend? Should they be resisted or obeyed? These are some of the questions that confront the scientific inquirer of the present day, and the answers to be given lie at the basis of philosophical history and of philosophical action, and demand the patient attention of every earnest mind.

There are those in modern times who contend that these mental and moral phenomena are as rigidly under the control of mechanical causes as floods and storms. Such is the theory of the Positive School of philosophers, of such men as Buckle and Herbert Spencer, and the present Westminster Reviewers, and a host of smaller imitators, resisted, however, by the ablest minds in Germany, and more feebly resisted in England and America by men who recoil from the inevitable disaster to morals that, it seems to them, must follow from rigidly adopting the theory, but who either are not able or inclined to grasp the theory manfully, and show where, if at all, its falsity appears.

All the arguments in favor of a blind undeviating necessity, as the cause of all mental phenomena, may be generalized into three, which really have nothing in common but the conclusion, and must be considered separately, each on its own merits. These arguments represent the three leading methods of logic—induction, analogy, deduction.

The inductive argument may be thus concisely stated: Facts show that many mental phenomena are simply and only effects. What is acknowledged of the many is, on the principe of induction, presumable of the whole.

The alleged facts relied upon to complete this induction are numerous and various. Beginning with the most obvious, it is stated that many drugs affect the mind and produce *emotions* and *thoughts* according to the undeniable law of cause and effect. Any man can buy courage or cheerfulness for a few cents in the shape of alcohol. Opium begets reason; the Indian hemp can be transmuted by the stomach into poetry. Poverty and luxury both generate crime. Variations in the weather adjust the proportions of murders and suicides. All human actions are compound chemical phenomena. Advancing to causes generally esteemed more moral, it is asserted that men may be educated into any desirable character. The power of religion, of education, could not be acknowledged, and cannot be conceived as resting on any other basis than an unchangeable law of cause and effect. The causes may be complicated, and sometimes occult, but nevertheless must exist; and therefore just as we believe that all iron is magnetic, though it has actually been tested of but a small portion of the iron in the world, so we must infer that all mental actions are produced by direct causes, finally resolvable into material agencies, because it is known to be true of many, and cannot certainly be disproved of any. Such is the inductive argument.

The argument from analogy is also plausibly presented, being founded on the acknowledged analogy between mind and matter. This analogy is one of the most wonderful and striking facts in the universe. Indeed it is claimed by some that both are but diverse manifestations of a third common substratum. This analogy is ingrained into language—all metaphysical terms being primarily physical, and not only so,

but it is almost impossible to find a term that can be used to denote a fact or phenomenon of matter that may not be used also to denote a phenomenon or fact of mind. And the contrary is also true. Now language, so far as it is perfect, is a transcript of what really exists. There must therefore be this universal likeness. But matter, it is acknowledged, is universally, from the most ponderous masses to the minutest atoms, under the chains of inexorable law. It has no self-control. The same fact, therefore, by analogy, must be predicated of mind. According to this theory public opinion cannot be accounted for except as you account for tides, volcanoes, or any other material movement.

The deductive, or *à priori* argument, is equally forcible. Without an acknowledgment of the inexorable succession of mental actions it is impossible that there should be any prognostication, any calculation of probabilities, any philosophy of history. History is not a science, but a fortuitous jumble of events. Chance is sovereign. Accident is normal. Each mind is a god. The past and the present have no band of connection. Granted, therefore, that order does exist or ought to exist, and the theory of inevitableness in moral events must be deduced.

These three branches of argumentation are adduced and urged with great energy and variety of illustration, and, it must be acknowledged, present a barrier to the doctrine of freedom in mind that cannot be removed by simple assertion or denial, and must be pronounced unanswerable, unless profound thought is able to look beyond them, and find in the soul a profounder basis of faith. If their conclusion be acknowledged, then our question, "What is the origin of public opinion?" is to inquire for a simple fact, to be discovered, like the source of the Nile, the cause of thunder-storms, the origin of cholera or any other disease, or the material agency which produces sterility or fertility of the soil. The question might still be curious, but would be divested of its chief interest, since whether we learn its source or not we cannot affect it. We are all alike effects, and only effects. Nothing could be different from what it is, and a Plato, an Alexander, a Jesus, or a Mohammed, are like an earthquake, or an aerolite, a deluge, or a hot summer's day, but links in an endless chain,

ever running on in this noisy and blind machinery which we call the universe, embracing both matter and mind.

But it cannot be denied that when we attempt to recognize this hypothesis as fact, the mind instinctively recoils from it. Even granting that the reasoning seems logical, the conclusion is repugnant, and therefore many deny it without seeking to justify their conclusion by logic. Thus an able modern medical writer says: "If a person should contend that the earth is over his head, and not beneath his feet, or that two and two make five, of course we leave him hopelessly to his folly: science and philosophy can never be expected to rid him of the delusion. In like manner, when it is said, or argued, that man is not free, that our volitions are necessitated, we have the primary facts of consciousness to rest upon in maintaining that we *are* free, and the universal consent of unsophisticated humanity will concur."* It need not be denied that on this inexpugnable repugnance to the slavery theory, the belief that the mind is itself a cause primarily rests. Mind does exist whether matter exists or not, and the edicts of mind must be accepted. It cannot and must not be confounded with its tools. Every human mind has, or would have if sufficiently developed, innate and positively true convictions, believed because felt to be true, the prime of which is that it is not itself the slave of antecedents.

All who recognize this, feel and see that they have a key to unlock many mysteries, and can maintain the great fundamental truths necessary to self-respect and to religion. The logical conclusion of the opposite theory is atheism, and if all who believe it are not atheists, it is either because they are poor logicians, or instinctively shrink back from the plunge into darkness which their philosophy requires. Herbert Spencer very accommodatingly allows a God to preside over that part of the universe which man does not understand, and assigns to religion that boundless territory which science has not yet explored! He thinks religionists should be satisfied with that, inasmuch as it is infinite in extent! Auguste Comte has logically and practically run his theory to its legitimate results, and feeling an instinctive desire for religion, is now worshiping

* An Introduction to the Practical Study of Insanity. By David Noble, F. R. C. S., etc. P. 22. London, 1853.

the mental image of a woman, and calling upon all his followers to join in the prayer and praise?* Verily this is a wonderful *Nova Instauratio!* The whole world is invited to become an insane hospital or an asylum for idiots.

In addition to the unsophisticated teachings of the human mind, a profound analysis of the facts of history, whether biographical or general, will show that the three main arguments of the Necessitarian are all vicious reasonings in a circle, assuming what was to be proved.

The induction leading to the conclusion that mental acts are a necessitated series of events, omits essential facts which demand another conclusion. The necessary sequence does not appear. Consciousness denies it. Observation confirms consciousness. Material influences interfere with mental action, but do not originate thought. Thoughts spring up utterly independent of them.

The analogy between matter and mind is only such as must exist on the supposition that matter and finite mind are both created, and one was designed to accommodate the other, while in the end mind was to control matter.

The deduction from the supposed necessity for order fails, if we allow, as facts teach us to allow, that order was never intended, except with the possibility of disorder; and then an order to be reached by experimentation, and through a voluntary subserviency to a higher law of mind alone, one essential element of which forever must be, that it can be disobeyed, and punished, and finally disorder become self-destructive and involuntarily obedient. In a word, we must believe in God, and in the Bible idea of the universe.

This theory simply enlarges the universe infinitely, greatly multiplying its mysteries we allow, but as greatly multiplying its beauties and glories; and instead of enthroning matter it enthrones mind; and instead of a constant passive obedience, immersed in acknowledged evil, substitutes a voluntary obedience or disobedience, the former of which we may hope will at last fully and forever prevail.

On this theory the question becomes awful: What originates public opinion? What gives the chapters into which history divides itself their various colorings? What makes of

* See Westminster Review, July, 1865, Article I.

one man a Bolingbroke, of another a Wilberforce; of one man a Jonathan Edwards, of another an Aaron Burr?

We shall find and conclude that each man has a narrow territory of independence, within which he may act from self-originated and self-directed power, and, uniting himself with others, contribute his share to produce the great swelling torrents of thoughts and passions that bear down weaker souls. We shall find that many have exerted this power unconsciously, but that the most godlike of men have done it consciously. We shall find the philosophy of history more complicated than the philosophy of nature, as it deals with many finite minds instead of one all-controlling mind. We shall find that, over and beyond the narrow limits of human freedom, there is a Divine Providence, who governs and yet respects the freedom of mind; and though the mysteries of existence can never be comprehended, we shall have the blissful assurance that our vision, so far as it does extend, coincides with that of the All-seeing One.

---

## Art. II.—THE GREEK CHURCH CONSIDERED PARTICULARLY IN ITS RELATION TO THE PROTESTANT.

In previous articles we have reviewed somewhat at length the relation of the Greek Church to the Latin. The comparison could not fail to result favorably to the former; while it has disclosed several important particulars in which the Greek Church must commend itself to the approbation of every true Protestant. Indeed, in the earliest days of the Reformation, Protestants directed a sympathetic look toward the Oriental Church, which had already five hundred years before issued its protest against Romanism. Repeatedly during the subsequent interval, the Protestant Church in some of its branches has initiated friendly negotiations; and up to the present time has ever held itself accessible to the freest intercommunication with the orthodox Church of the East.

But we are not to be misled by sympathy or interest. We are to be just to the truth, and true to the infallible standard. Trying ourselves by the divine word, we must subject all others to the same unerring test, remembering the inspired

admonition: "If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

The comparison, then, is no longer between the Greek Church and the Latin; but between Eastern orthodoxy and Western evangelicity—the relation of the Greek Church to the Protestant.

It is well understood that the first friendly proffer of negotiation, made by Melancthon to the patriarch Joasaph II., elicited no response. This silence received various interpretations. But while it excited suspicion, it did not extinguish hope. A subsequent attempt at negotiation was more successful. The patriarch Jeremiah replied to the address of the Lutheran divines, but unfavorably; and for many years Protestant effort in this direction was discontinued.

Meanwhile a Greek priest, of remarkable ability and promise, educated at Venice and Padua, traveled over Italy and Germany, and visited the famous Protestant city of Geneva, where he studied for a time, forming an intimate acquaintance with some of the leading Protestant divines, and acquiring "a strong predilection for the doctrines of the Reformed Church, which he retained till his death." His early promise was fulfilled with rapid advancement and increasing influence. Poland was domineering over Russia. Sigismund III. was ambitious of uniting the Greek Church with the Church of Rome. This priest, Cyrillus Lucaris, was commissioned by the Patriarch of Alexandria, as his deputy to the Synod of Brezc, to defeat this attempt. The imperial project failed, and Cyril Lucar was compelled to fly for his life from the fury of Sigismund. In 1602 Cyril became Patriarch of Alexandria. A score of years later he was transferred to Constantinople, and was recognized as the leading patriarch of the East. Still he ardently cherished his liberal views. He corresponded with distinguished Protestants in England, Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland; complained in his letters of the ambitious interference of itinerant emissaries of Rome; indicated his desire to make common cause with the Protestants against the common enemy; and in 1629 sent to Geneva his confession of faith, which he had printed in Latin at Constantinople, and which produced a marked impression upon the Greeks and Catholics of the Orient. At the same time Greek jealousy

and Roman hostility were aroused; and in the space of seventeen years this worthy patriarch was four times deposed, and as often restored. Each deposition was esteemed a triumph by the Catholic instigators; and each restoration was hailed with pleasure by sympathizing Protestants. The strife terminated in the violent death of the patriarch in 1638.

These circumstances had the effect to revive Protestant hopes and interests in the Greek Church, and negotiations were renewed. In the East and the West the subject "engrossed much attention during the latter half of the seventeenth century," and as a consequence important questions were raised and synods were convoked. An earnest rivalry sprung up between the Papists and Protestants. The former, under the name of Greek Uniats, striving to absorb the Eastern Church, were invading it in the one direction from Poland, in the other from Turkey; the latter were endeavoring to unite with the Greek Church in a league offensive and defensive against the encroachments of the Roman Church.

Bolchofsky, a candidate of theology in the Spiritual Academy at St. Petersburgh, in an elaborate essay in which he characterizes the existing state of things as a consequence of the fierce struggle between the Calvinists and the Papists, says, "The former sought to strengthen their cause by making out that the Eastern Church was on their side; while the latter, from hatred to Cyril Lucar, with one voice re-echoed their assertions that he was really in belief a Calvinist." (Blackmore's Doctrine of the Russian Church, p. 19.)

Evidently the specific views of the Greek Church upon the questions at issue were not well defined. Resting upon the decisions, and content with the formulas, of the early General Councils, especially of Nice and Constantinople, she had manifested but little of doctrinal development. Indeed she gloried in her primitive orthodoxy, and cheerfully accepted the title of "immutable." For eight hundred years no Ecumenical Council had assembled. Her last great theologian, St. John Damascene, had indeed arranged the doctrinal views of the Christian Fathers in scientific and systematic form in his treatise, "De Fide Orthodoxa," which the Greek Church reverentially accepted. But full eight centuries had passed away since St. John Damascene had bequeathed to the Church this im-

important legacy; and there was some plausibility in the charge preferred against the Eastern Church, cited and answered by the distinguished Peter Mogila. "Enemies of orthodoxy, that is, the papists, have composed and printed in the Polish language certain railings against our Orthodox Church, giving out everywhere that the Russian clergy are so ignorant that they know not either their own faith or their own ceremonies."

With ambitious zeal the Papists proposed to supply this lack by surreptitiously introducing Romish books and Romish notions into the Eastern Church. And Bolchofsky, in the essay just mentioned, concludes that Peter Mogila composed his "Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East" more against the Papists than either the Lutherans or Calvinists, inasmuch as he had more reason to apprehend danger from them than from either of the two last named sects.

But whatever may have been the prevailing motive with Peter Mogila, it is difficult to believe that the Greek Synod convoked at Constantinople in 1638 and 1642, at Jassy in 1643, and at Bethlehem in 1672, were friendly toward Calvinism. In 1638 the Synod at Constantinople condemned Cyril Lucar as a heretic, and anathematized his memory. In 1642 the Synod condemned the Confession and its author. The Synod at Jassy condemned Calvinism, without including the person of Cyril Lucar. And the Synod of Bethlehem exculpated and vindicated Cyril, but condemned the Confession bearing his name, asserting that it had been forged by Calvinistic heretics. Indeed the Synod of Jassy, according to Bolchofsky, was convoked upon the request of the Prince of Moldavia especially for this reason: he finding much scandal and confusion to be caused in his provinces by the Calvinists, and particularly by the Calvinistic Confessions then everywhere circulated under the name of Cyril Lucar, had requested Parthenius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Peter Mogila, Metropolitan of Kieff, to assemble a Synod at Jassy against the Calvinistic heresy. To this council Parthenius sent, as from himself and his Synod at Constantinople, (1642) a synodal letter containing a formula of Eighteen Articles drawn up against the Calvinists, with four important questions and their answers

appended. These were subscribed by the Synod of Jassy, and thirty years after they were approved by the Synod at Bethlehem, and offered as an ultimatum to the Protestants. Unquestionably these synodical acts were begotten of the spirit of controversy, and nourished by the officious intermeddling of Rome. Smith, a priest of the Church of England, in his history of the Greek Church, published in 1680, says: "The Greeks have of late years been more than ever wrought upon by the sly intrigues and insinuations and underhand dealing of the subtle emissaries of Rome, who watch continually over the poor Greeks, and take every advantage of their poverty and distress to bring them to further compliance, and finally to a downright subjection. I doubt not that time, which is the great revealer of secrets, will discover the mystery of the last synod held by the Patriarch of Jerusalem."

Masson avers his strong suspicion that these synodical acts "were prompted by popish influence, as there are few things Rome would dread more than an intimate connection between the Protestant and Greek Churches." Blackmore admits that they bear the suspicion of Latin influence. And John Mason Neale, who would be slow to discredit anything orthodox, asserts that "they have a clear taint of Latinism;" that before and during this period some Greek communities were "torn to pieces with the schism of the Uniats or Romanized Greeks;" and that "even in the Orthodox Churches Latin doctrine was everywhere preached."

Historical justice demands that so much at least be said of the circumstances in which the Synods of Constantinople, Jassy, and Bethlehem assembled and condemned Calvinism.

But these facts do not render nugatory these synodical acts, nor avert their bearing; for they have been received, so far as respects their substance at least, throughout the whole Eastern communion, and are repeatedly referred to as of authority in the Russian Catechisms. (Blackmore's Preface, p. 7.)

In the mean time Russia was advancing to a position of political and ecclesiastical prominence. She held a patriarchate equal in authority with that of Constantinople. Her emperor, Peter the Great, traveled through southern and western Europe as far as England. Whether influenced by the example of England or not, upon his return to Russia he

dispensed with the patriarchate of the Orthodox Church in his realm, established a synod in its stead, and, placing himself at its head, made the Church national. Throughout the empire the Greek Church became the Russian, changed not in its doctrines, but in its administration. Henceforth Russia becomes by far the most important portion of the Greek Church, whether viewed ecclesiastically or politically. Of the four or five score millions that compose the membership of the Greek Church, five sixths of the number are found within the realm of the czar; while the Sclavonic is the Church language not only of all the Russias, but also of Wallachia, Bulgaria, Moldavia, Servia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Slavonia, and Dalmatia. As has been finely said, "This noble language is perhaps more completely a Church language than any other. Unlike its rivals in this respect, Latin and Greek, it had no previous literature; it was adapted to ecclesiastical purposes in its full freshness and vigor, not in its decay; and it has not, like the Latin, served as the medium of works purely literary. The Church gave it its letters; and its letters, obsolete in other respects, now serve only for the use of the Church."

But politically no less than ecclesiastically does the Russian Church hold a vast preponderance in the Greek Church. In Turkey, in Egypt, in Syria, the Greek Church is subject. In Greece it has very recently become independent. While in Russia, before the close of the seventeenth century, it became grandly imperial; and the empire of the czar took rank among the great powers of the world. Though the local center of the Greek Church is at Constantinople, yet its personal head is and has been for four centuries, says Dean Stanley, the great czar. The Russian Church is the representative of the old imperial Church of Constantinople.

After the visit of Peter the Great to western Europe, Protestants turned their attention eastward with new interest. Negotiations were again proposed. The English divines addressed to the Greek Church a book of questions, and proffers of intercommunication. After considerable delay an Ultimatum was returned, signed by the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Eastern Church. Two years before it had been sent to the Russian Synod for its concurrence, and thence was forwarded to the English bishops. This Ulti-

matum consisted of the Eighteen Articles, together with the questions and answers originated at the Synod of Jassy, 1643, and approved by the Synod of Bethlehem, (or so-called Jerusalem Council,) 1672. The reply was peremptory and final on the part of the patriarchs. If received in substance and detail, well; if rejected, it was to foreclose negotiations. The Russian Synod, however, acting with an independence to which which it was fairly entitled, modified somewhat two important Articles, XVII and XVIII, and maintained a milder bearing toward the English bishops, inclosing two most friendly epistles with the Ultimatum of the patriarchs. The one epistle, besides conveying the kindly feeling of the Russian Synod, bears this generous proposition from the emperor: "He thinks it fit that you should send two persons from among yourselves to have a friendly conference in the name and spirit of Christ, with two that shall be chosen of our brethren. Hereby the opinions, arguments, and persuasions of each party may be more sincerely produced and more clearly understood; and it may be more easily known what may be yielded and given up by one to the other; what, on the other hand, may and ought for conscience' sake to be absolutely denied. In the mean time no prejudice will befall either your communion or ours by such private conference, nor the hope of future union be lost or compromised."

The other epistle, bearing date one year later, refers to the Ultimatum of the patriarchs, and their letter declining further conference, but declares that the emperor still continues in the same mind, and closes in this independent and friendly manner: "We desire your charity to know that if in accordance with the advice of our sovereign you will send two of your brethren to a conference, which we again entreat you to do, we may hope to bring our wishes to a more easy conclusion; which that at length He, even the Lawgiver of love, the God of peace, the Father of mercies may prosper, is our hearty desire and prayer."

But these flattering expectations were doomed to disappointment. Negotiations were again discontinued, and for more than a century were not repeated.

Recently, however, as is well known, the question has been revived in England and America. In both countries resolu-

tions have been passed upon the subject. Correspondence has been opened with the Russian Church. The Protestant Episcopal Church of America, in 1862, appointed a committee to consider the question of "establishing intercommunication with the Russo-Greek Church." The Episcopal Convocation of Canterbury, England, in 1863, took especial notice of this proceeding of the American Church, and by official action called the attention of the Upper House to the subject. In prosecution of this plan, an English clergyman visited Russia with commendatory letters not only from the bishops of England, but also from Bishop Potter of Pennsylvania, and several of the colonial bishops. The Russian reply, together with some friendly suggestions, declared the opinion that "the present time is more favorable than those selected for former attempts." The "Evangelical Herald" of Athens, Greece, at one time expressed a hope that some amicable adjustment might be made, but objected against the Protestant Church its error of free investigation; and at a later period stated that the educated classes in Russia lean toward the Protestants rather than the Romanists, and that the Protestant Churches would probably receive many from the Greek Church when entire religious liberty in Russia is proclaimed. In England an "Eastern Church Association," with a strong committee, has been formed, whose objects are:

1. To inform the English public as to the state of the Eastern Christians, in order gradually to better their condition through the influence of public opinion in England.

2. To make known the doctrines and principles of the Anglican Church to our Christian brethren of the East.

3. To take advantage of all opportunities which the providence of God shall afford us for intercommunion with the Orthodox Church, and also for friendly intercourse with the other ancient Churches of the East.

4. To assist, so far as our pecuniary means will permit, the bishops of the Orthodox Church in their efforts to promote the spiritual welfare of their flocks.

In New York "The Christian Union Society" was organized in 1864 with this specific object: The bringing about a union of all Churches holding to the doctrine of the apostolical suc-

cession of bishops. Similar societies have been formed in other cities of the United States.

In France, two periodicals, "*Observateur Catholique*" and "*Union Chrétien*," advocate this same movement. Other organizations have been established with a similar object. The representative of the American Episcopal Church was favorably received by the Russo-Greek Church, and encouraged to hope that a better relation might be secured between the Churches; and the late Triennial Episcopal Convention at Philadelphia (1865) adopted the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That all those branches of the Apostolic Church which accept the Holy Scriptures and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, and which reject the usurpations and innovations of the Bishop of Rome, be called by the course of events, and by the indications of Divine Providence, to renew those primitive relations which the Roman schism has interrupted.

The question of union or co-operation between the Greeks and Protestants, it will be perceived, had not been lost sight of since it was first proposed by Melancthon. On the contrary, it has been repeatedly canvassed with great earnestness and expectation. But this question is by no means paramount. The vital inquiry is, rather, Is the Greek Church orthodox as she claims, and evangelic? What is her faith and practice? This question answered, we shall be prepared intelligently to reply to another question: Is the regeneration of the Greek Church compatible with the integrity of her standards? And then, finally, to consider this practical inquiry: What policy should Protestants pursue toward the Greek Church?

Some travelers, admiring the antiquity, order, and numerical greatness of the Eastern Church, have promptly answered the two former questions in the affirmative. Others, repelled by her manifest faults and follies, have as readily replied in the negative. One writer openly asserts that "there is no inherent virtue in the Greek religion;" while another, after an acquaintance of twenty-five years, declares that "the principles of the Protestant Reformation and Eastern Orthodoxy, separated from practical abuse and fairly exhibited, are identical."

One asserts that the system has been overburdened by sac-

ramental extravagances till it has degenerated into "a religion of sacraments;" while another avers that "in reference to sacraments there is no occasion for dispute between Protestants and Greeks."

A reviewer, who has "consulted an enormous mass of material," is confirmed in his opinion of the corruption of the Greek Church in doctrine and in practice; while a traveler, whose first impression on entering Russia induced a similar conclusion, says: "On better information, however, I find this a hasty conclusion as it regards doctrine, and not borne out by fact."

One author declares (with no reference to authority) that the Greek Church never sold indulgences, and abominates the doctrine of supererogation; while a reviewer (with no reference to authority) declares that the Greek Church deals largely in the sale of indulgences and dispensations. The same reviewer asserts (with the same omission of authority) that the Greek Church believes in the existence of purgatory with all its horrors; while a long array of writers assert that the Greek Church discards the doctrine of purgatory. One book is written in the interests of Romanism, like Schmitt's *Kritische Gerschichte der neugriechischen und der Russischen Kirche;* while another, like John Mason Neale's *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, is committed to sustain the English High Church view. Neale, and Pinkerton, and Masson, and Waddington are delighted with the toleration exercised by the Greek Church; while Berry, and King, and Mosheim are shocked by her intolerance. Variety of circumstance and sympathy, in different individuals, will partially account for this strange discrepancy. But in the judgment of charity this cannot be the only reason. There is, indeed, a difficulty in securing authorized and uniform data. The Eastern Church has no Thirty-nine Articles like those subscribed in England; no symbolical books, strictly speaking, like those of the Protestant and Reformed; no oath, like that of Pope Pius IV.; beyond the Creed itself (the Nicene Creed) she has no general doctrinal tests. But all doctrine of faith which has been written by orthodox men, or by whole synods, so far as it is known to have the sanction of the Church, is to be received as authoritative; for instance: the doctrine written in

St. Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, in St. John Damascene's treatise "On the Faith," in the Orthodox Confession, in the Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem, and in the present Russian Catechisms, must be held by all members of the Eastern Church to be one and the same thing in substance with the Creed itself, so far as it is felt and known that these different treatises and expressions have been approved by the Church. (Blackmore's Preface, VIII and IX.)

In accordance with these principles the Russian Synod in 1723, as already stated, modified somewhat the Ultimatum of the patriarchs; and again, in 1838, made additional modifications, even omitting one whole answer which it could not approve. Hence Blackmore (Preface, IX) maintains that the Longer Catechism, though identical of course in the substance of doctrine with all the documents approved by the Eastern Church, is yet in many points of detail, in method and language, and even in some minor doctrinal respects, of greater weight and value than the Orthodox Confession of Peter Mogila, or the Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem.

Our remark then is, that whatever merit the simple assertion of any reviewer may have, the reader will prefer to see the assertion supported by authority; and when references are given, to have a guide to the comparative value of the authorities. This guide is suggested by the comparison just made.

We are now prepared for the question: Is the Greek Church orthodox, as she claims, and evangelic? This her own records must show. There are properly three lines of inquiry:

I. What is her rule of faith and practice?

II. What is her faith?

III. What is her practice?

1. What is the *rule* of faith and practice recognized by the Greek Church? "The Duty of Parish Priests," a book of instructions to be studied by every candidate for holy orders, and translated by Blackmore, together with the Russian Catechisms, answers, (section ix:) "All the articles of the faith are contained in the word of God. Hence it follows, (section xi,) beyond dispute, that we hold the word of God as the source, foundation, and perfect rule both of our holy faith, and of the

good works of the law." The word of God is defined, (sections ix, xi, and xii,) as the books of the Old and New Testaments.

The Longer Catechism, page 38, gives the enumeration, which accords precisely with the enumeration of the inspired books in our Protestant Bibles; and, to make this limitation more exact, specifically excludes the apochryphal books. With this accords the remark of Hagenbach, I., p. 424: "The Greek Church allowed that the Apocrypha was useful and edifying, but definitely distinguished these from the canonical books." With this regard for Holy Scripture agrees the statement of Archbishop Platon, in his "System of Divinity," in explanation of the second commandment: "We must hold to the divine word alone, and rest assured that it only contains the true rules by which we ought to please God; and therefore Christ said concerning the Holy Scripures, that in them is contained eternal life."

Of the same tenor is the injunction of the Metropolitan Michael, Sermon VI, translated by Pinkerton: "We must be of a believing spirit with regard to all that the Holy Scriptures reveal to us, not joining to them our own unfounded opinions and erroneous explanations."

The formula drawn up by Philaret, Professor of Divinity and Metropolitan of Moscow, is in harmony with this, Article I. and onward: "The only pure and all-sufficient source of the doctrines of faith is the revealed word of God contained now in the Holy Scriptures." 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.

But these comparatively individual views, however excellent and respected, have not acquired the force of authority, certainly not of chief authority. Upon this point there is other evidence, not only higher, but conclusive, which we are bound to adduce.

In the Ultimatum of the patriarchs to the English bishops (1723) Article II declares: "We ought to believe the sacred Scriptures without doubt, not indeed otherwise than as the Catholic Church has expounded and handed down. . . . Therefore we believe also that the testimony of the Catholic Church is not inferior to that of the Holy Scripture. For one and the same Holy Ghost being the Creator of both, it is precisely the same to be instructed by the Holy Scripture or by the Catholic Church. . . . Hence the Catholic Church is

always as infallible as the Sacred Scripture, and has perpetual authority." (W. C. King's Translation, p. 35.)

And the Longer Catechism asserts, page 41: "We must take and understand Holy Scripture in such sense as agrees with the interpretation of the Orthodox Church and the holy fathers." And (page 36) St. Basil, referring to the doctrines and injunctions receceived from the Holy Scripture and from holy tradition, is quoted thus: "Both the former and the latter have one and the same force for piety; and this will be contradicted by no one who has ever so little knowledge in the ordínances of the Church."

Were it my province to argue this point, I might readily show that these assumptions, put forth in behalf of tradition, are innovations hostile at once to the consistency and orthodoxy of the Greek Church, by referring to the account of the First Ecumenical Council at Nicæa, given by Sozomen, and Socrates, and other Church historians.

But although demonstrable that these are innovations of the Greek Church, both inconsistent and heretical, still they exist; and thus the *rule* of faith and practice is vitiated. This point is of unquestionable importance. The *rule* of faith is decisive for what may follow. Any defect here must be most dangerous in its scope and tendency. Anything less than a divine standard opens the possibility for limitless errors. The primary principle of the Reformers was, *Scriptura sufficit.* The ultimate test was the divine word. On this ground the battle between Romanism and the Reformation was fought and won. And ever since, this has been the first formula of Protestantism: The word of God is sufficient for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are the perfect and only rule of faith and practice. This is the *formal* principle of Protestant Christianity, originating the whole system, and limiting it by a divine rule; discarding the pretentious claim of pope or council, and accepting the supreme authority of the divine word.

Having ascertained, by impartial testimony, the rule of faith and practice, we reach the question next in order, What is the *faith* of the Greek Church in its relation to Protestantism?

The great first want of man is to know whence he is, and to whom accountable. The Scriptures reveal God to us. The task is to arrange a theology. This the Greeks did, with

remarkable acumen, investigating and settling theology and Christology for them and for all time. Their theology proper is admirably stated in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten, begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made. I believe in one Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of life, who proceeded from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets." These simple formulas, expressing the divine trinity and unity, the divinity of Christ and the personality of the Holy Ghost, have been accepted as articles of faith by Protestants equally with Greeks and Latins. The single point of divergence is the procession of the Holy Ghost, which Protestants as well as Latins derive from the Father and the Son. This question has been for centuries an occasion of dispute between the Greeks and Latins. At the Council of Florence, 1439, when a temporary but fruitless union was effected, the Greeks made their most determined stand upon this dogma, occupying in its discussion twenty-four entire sessions of the council, and most of the twenty-fifth session. In 1848, when Pope Pius IX. addressed an Encyclical Letter to "the Christians of the East," urging them to unite with (that is, submit to) the Roman hierarchy, the patriarchs in their reply gave especial prominence to this doctrine. Fifteen distinct arguments, defensive and direct, were employed, covering ten pages of their Encyclical!

The scriptural argument advanced by the Greek theologians in support of this doctrine, is the declaration of Jesus recorded in John xv, 26: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me."

The philosophic argument is, that the Father sustains the primordial relation of "*fons divinitatis*," of whom the Son is begotten and from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds; and hence the Holy Spirit is not inferior to, nor dependent upon, the Son.

The traditional argument is the antiquity of the doctrine, based upon the formula of the first Ecumenical Council.

Whatever may be the relative merit of the arguments drawn from Scripture and philosophy in support of either view, it must be admitted that the argument from tradition is in favor of the oriental theory, since the single procession of the Holy Ghost is taught by the Nicene Creed, and the Filioque is the interpolation, of after generations. We wonder that a difference so slight and unessential should ever have assumed such proportions, and exerted such a pervading and potent influence. And we readily appreciate and approve the judicious estimate of Archbishop Platon: "We do not wish to pry into this, for it is an unsearchable mystery; and we ought not to engage much in dispute upon it."

The Nicene Symbol, accepted without question by the Greek Church, also asserts the incarnation of Jesus Christ, his sufferings and death, his resurrection and ascension, and his final coming and judgment. In these doctrines Protestant and Greek Christians agree. What is their relative importance in the Christian system it is not necessary for us, if it were competent, to determine. Luther claimed the first place for the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ. Dean Stanley asserts that, next to the moral doctrines of the Gospel, the most vital, comprehensive, and fruitful has been and is, not the power of the pope or of the council, not the supremacy of the Bible or the authority of its several books, not the sacraments, not original sin, not predestination, not justification, but the doctrine of the incarnation. The Nicene Creed, says Dorner, showed to Christian theology the end at which it was to aim, even if it did not perfectly realize that end. Arianism had pressed back toward Ebionitism. . It had lost the idea of the Incarnation, . . . and made a perfect revelation or manifestation of God impossible. The Nicene Fathers met this by proclaiming the real and proper divinity of the Son. However we may regard this statement of Dorner, it is evident that in this creed is formally answered the fundamental question propounded by the Saviour: "What think ye of Christ?" Protestants as well as Greeks cordially adopt the remaining articles of the Nicene Creed: "I believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

These general doctrines were somewhat expanded and carefully defined by subsequent councils. The speculations of the Greek Fathers were directed chiefly toward theology, and their writings based mainly upon the creed which they were intended to illustrate and maintain. After these were combined into systematic form by St. John Damascene, the Greek Church for eight hundred years presents but little of doctrinal disquisition or development; while its external history during the long interval is distinguished by its disputes with the Roman Church, and by the firmness with which it resisted every overture of union. (Waddington on the Greek Church, p. 76.) Onward to the seventeenth century Bolchofsky asserts that the Russian Church, in common with the rest of the Eastern, found no need of any special doctrinal standards of her own, but was content to refer for her faith to the writings of the ancient Fathers, and especially to the treatise of St. John Damascene. She received and self-complacently appropriated to herself the epithet "immutable," claiming to represent the primitive Church in her faith and forms. Wherever, then, in her formularies she has not given full expression upon any specific point, the declarations of the Greek Fathers will relieve the obscurity and safely guide us in our conclusions. Though this research will not lighten our task, it will compensate us by presenting both the modern and primitive in one view. This will appear somewhat in the doctrine of redemption, and particularly in the doctrine of sin, or Greek anthropology and soteriology, which are of especial importance in this discussion, and which, together with the Greek theory of the Church and sacraments, we reserve for another article, and in the order intimated. The present article we conclude with a notice of the Greek Church view of predestination.

In regard to predestination, or divine decrees, it has been said by a certain reviewer (with no reference to authority) that of the Eastern Church the Russians, to a far greater extent that the Greeks, recognize the doctrine of predestination. How much this signifies it is extremely difficult to conjecture, as he does not inform us whether the Greeks accept or reject this doctrine. The difficulty is not diminished when we are told, but not by this reviewer, that a common text-book of high authority in Greece is "The Orthodox Instructor, or Sum-

mary of Christian Theology," by Platon, Archbishop of Moscow, of like authority in Russia. Another reviewer asserts (with no mention of authority) that it has been said that many of the Russian clergy are ardent admirers of Calvin, but all the leading theologians, and indeed the ecclesiastical acts that are read in their churches, denounce Calvinism as a dangerous heresy.

The Synod of Jassy, it will be remembered, was summoned at the instance of the Prince of Moldavia, because of scandal and confusion occasioned in his provinces by the Calvinists, and especially by the Calvinistic Confessions bearing the name of Cyril Lucar. To this synod the Patriarch of Constantinople sent a synodal letter containing eighteen articles drawn up against the Calvinists, together with answers to four questions appended. These articles the Synod of Jassy subscribed. In 1672, at the Synod of Bethlehem, these eighteen articles and the questions and answers were considered and approved, and in 1723 were sent by the patriarchs as an ultimatum to the English bishops. Both these synods revised and approved the book by Peter Mogila, styled "The Orthodox Confession," etc. This Confession therefore unquestionably harmonizes with the Ultimatum in reference to the doctrine of predestination. Hence citations from the latter will suffice upon this point.

The Eighteen Articles of the Synods of Jassy and Bethlehem follow the order of the Articles of Cyril Lucar, which they are designed to complete and condemn. Cyril says, in Article III of his Confession, "We believe that the perfectly good God, before the foundation of the world, predestined to glory whom he had elected, in no respect regarding their works, nor having any cause impelling him to this election other than his good will, divine mercy. In like manner before time was, that he rejected whom he has rejected; the cause of this rejection, if we look to the uncontrolled mastery and dominion of God, we shall doubtless discover to be the divine will; if we turn to laws and rules of order which Providence uses in the government of the world, we shall perceive it to be his justice; for God is merciful and just also." Article III of the synods accordingly treats of predestination thus: "We believe that God, who is exceedingly good, from eternity ordained to glory those whom he has

chosen, and gave up to condemnation those whom he rejected; but not that he thus willed to justify the former and give up to condemnation the latter without cause. . . . But foreseeing those would use their free-will well, but these ill, he foreordained or condemned. . . . But for execrable heretics to say that God foreordains or condemns without reference to the works of those foreordained or condemned, we know is impious and profane. . . . But that the divine will should be the cause of those who are condemned thus simply, and without reason, what madness does it not show! . . . For God equally desires the salvation of all; as we know that respect of persons has no place with him, and we acknowledge as right the giving up to condemnation those vessels who have become profane by their own wicked choice and impenitent heart." This article, of which we have quoted a part, concludes with a solemn anathema pronounced against those who believe and teach the opposite doctrine.

If it be said that there are other Russian authorities, which have appeared since the date of the synods, and which should be summoned, we refer to Platon's "Orthodox Instructor," pp. 120, 122, quoted by Masson, p. 6: "We see in these times, to the great scandal of Christianity, three principal heresies, those, namely, of the Papists, the Lutherans, and the Calvinists. And these three are different, each from the others. The Lutherans and Calvinists were separated no long time ago from the Papists by means of Luther and Calvin; in their wish, however, to throw off the papistical superstitions, they cast away in like manner the apostolic traditions also. They hold in common the opinion of the Western Church concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost; but especially the Lutherans assign to the body of Christ the attribute of omnipresence, which is peculiar to the divinity alone; and the Calvinists subject all human actions to a fixed and unavoidable decree.

The Longer Catechism of the Russian Church, with theological precision, defines predestination thus: "That will of God by which man is designed for eternal happiness." It then proceeds:

*Q.* Does God's predestination remain unchanged, seeing that now man is unhappy?

*A.* It remains unchanged; inasmuch as God of his foreknowledge and infinite mercy hath predestined to open for man, even after his departure from the way of happiness, a new way of happiness, through his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. "He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," are the words of the Apostle Paul, Eph. i, 4.

*Q.* How are we to understand the predestination of God with respect to men in general, and to each man severally?

*A.* God has predestined to give to all men, and has actually given them, preventing grace, and means sufficient for the attainment of happiness.

*Q.* What is said of this by the word of God?

*A.* For whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate. Rom. viii, 29.

*Q.* How does the Orthodox Church speak on this point?

*A.* In the Exposition of the Faith by the Eastern Patriarchs it is said: "As he foresaw that some would use well their free-will, but others ill, he accordingly predestined the former to glory, while the latter he condemned." Art. III.

The very article, it will be remembered, which I have cited from the Ultimatum of the patriarchs to the English bishops. In this view foreknowledge is evidently the basis of foreordination.

Without lingering to multiply illustrations from the Greek Fathers, I conclude with the words of St. John Damascene, (*De Fide Orthodoxa II, c.* 30): "Χρὴ γινώσκειν, ὡ πάντα μὲν προγινώσκει ὁ θεὸς, οὐ πάντα δὲ προορίζει· γαρ τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, οὐ προορίζει δὲ αὐτά"—intimating here, as elsewhere, that although God foreknows, yet he does not foreordain our moral character.

## Art. III.—WORSHIP OF RELICS, AND THE MIRACLES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.*

The worship of relics legitimately followed the worship of the Virgin Mary, of martyrs and saints, and took its rise simul-

* For the most ample material on this whole subject, the reader is especially referred to the famous *Acta Sanctorum quotquot toto orbe voluntur*, thus far fifty-eight volumes fol., (1643–1864,) coming down to October 22d, and now slowly approaching completion. This rare and costly work of the Bollandists is arranged after the Roman Calendar, and is the richest source for the knowledge of religious life, the worship of martyr saints and relics in the Roman Catholic Church. A complete copy of it may be found in the Astor Library, and another in the Union Theological Seminary Library of New York.

taneously in the Nicene and post-Nicene age, after the close of the heroic martyr age of Christianity, and with the influx of the entire heathen population of the Roman empire, with all its idolatrous and superstitious traditions and habits, into the Græco-Roman Catholic Church. We propose in this essay to give a condensed account of the origin and progress of this worship, with some observations on the character and credibility of the ancient Catholic miracles connected with the same.

Worship, in a limited sense and subordinate to the supreme worship due to God, was accorded to the *persons* of departed saints in glory, and in a lower degree also to their earthly *remains* and *relics*, (*reliquiæ* or *reliqua*, λείψανα.) By these we are to understand, first, their bodies, or rather parts of them —bones, blood, ashes; then all which was in any way closely connected with their persons—clothes, staff, furniture, and especially the instruments of their martyrdom. After the time of Ambrose the cross of Christ also was included, and subsequently his crown of thorns and his coat, which are preserved, the former in Paris, the latter in Treves. The cross of Christ, with the superscription and the nails, is said to have been miraculously discovered by the Empress Helena in 326. The legend of the "invention of the cross," (*inventio s. crucis*,) which is celebrated in the Greek and Latin Church by a special festival, is at best faintly implied in Eusebius, in a letter of Constantine to the Bishop Macarius of Jerusalem. (*Vita Const. iii*, 30, though in *iii*, 25, where it should be expected, it is entirely unnoticed, as Gieseler correctly observes,) and does not appear till several decennia later, first in Cyril of Jerusalem, (whose *Epist. ad Constantium* of 351, however, is considered by Gieseler and others, on critical and theological grounds, a much later production,) then, with good agreement as to the main fact, in Ambrose, Chrysostom, Paulinus of Nola, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and other Fathers. With all these witnesses the fact is still hardly credible, and has against it particularly the following considerations: 1. The place of the crucifixion was desecrated under the Emperor Hadrian by heathen temples and statues, besides being filled up and defaced beyond recognition. 2. There is no clear testimony of a *contemporary*. 3. The pilgrim from

Bordeaux, who visited Jerusalem in 333, and in a still extant *itinerarium* (*Vetera Rom. itineraria, ed. P. Wesseling*, p. 593) enumerates all the sacred things of the holy city, knows nothing of the holy cross, or its invention, (compare Gieseler, Church History, German ed., vol. i, 2, p. 279, note 37; Edinb. ed, vol. ii, p. 36.) This miracle contributed very much to the increase of the superstitious use of crosses and crucifixes. Cyril of Jerusalem remarks, that about 380 the splinters of the holy cross filled the whole world, and yet, according to the account of the devout but credulous Paulinus, of Nola, (Epist. 31, al. 11,) the original remained in Jerusalem undiminished—a continual miracle! Besides Gieseler, compare particularly the minute investigation of this legend by Isaac Taylor: The Invention of the Cross, and the Miracles therewith connected, in "Ancient Christianity," vol. ii, pp. 277–315.)

Relics of the *body* of Christ cannot be thought of, since he arose without seeing corruption, ascended to heaven, where, above the reach of idolatry and superstition, he is enthroned at the right hand of the Father. His true relics are the holy supper and his living presence in the Church to the end of the world.

The worship of relics, like the worship of Mary and the saints, began in a sound religious feeling of reverence, of love, and of gratitude, but has swollen to an avalanche, and rushed into all kinds of superstitious and idolatrous excess. "The most glorious thing that the mind conceives," says Goethe, "is always set upon by a throng of more and more foreign matter." As Israel could not sustain the pure elevation of its divinely revealed religion, but lusted after the flesh-pots of Egypt and coquetted with sensuous heathenism, so it fared also with the ancient Church.

The worship of relics cannot be derived from Judaism; for the Levitical law strictly prohibited the contact of bodies and bones of the dead as defiling.* Yet the isolated instance of the bones of the prophet Elisha quickening by their con-

* Num. xix, 11 sqq.; xxxi, 19. The touching of a corpse, or a dead bone, or a grave, made one unclean seven days, and was to be expiated by washing, upon pain of death. The tent, also, in which a person had died, and all open vessels in it, were unclean. (Compare Josephus c. Apion, ii, 26; Antiq., iii, xi, 3.) The Talmudists made the laws still more stringent on this point.

tact a dead man who was cast into his tomb,* was quoted in behalf of the miraculous power of relics; though it should be observed that even this miracle did not lead the Israelites to do homage to the bones of the prophet, nor abolish the law of the uncleanness of a corpse.

The heathen abhorred corpses and burnt them to ashes, except in Egypt, where embalming was the custom, and was imitated by the Christians on the death of martyrs, though St. Anthony of Egypt protested against it. There are examples, however, of the preservation of the bones of distinguished heroes, like Theseus, and of the erection of temples over their graves.†

The Christian relic worship was primarily a natural consequence of the worship of the saints, and was closely connected with the Christian doctrine of the *resurrection of the body*, which was an essential article of the apostolic tradition, and is incorporated in almost all the ancient creeds. For, according to the Gospel, the body is not an evil substance, as the Platonists, Gnostics, and Manichæans held, but a creature of God; it is redeemed by Christ; it becomes by the regeneration an organ and temple of the Holy Ghost; and it rests as a living seed in the grave, to be raised again at the last day and changed into the likeness of the glorious body of Christ. The bodies of the righteous "grow green" in their graves, to burst forth in glorious bloom on the morning of the resurrection. The first Christians from the beginning set great store by this comforting doctrine, at which the heathen, like Celsus and Julian, scoffed. Hence they abhorred also the heathen custom of burning, and adopted the Jewish custom of burial with solemn religious ceremonies, which, however, varied in different times and countries.

But in the closer definition of the dogma of the resurrection two different tendencies appeared: one spiritualistic, represented by the Alexandrians, particularly by Origen, and still later by the two Gregories; the other more realistic, advocated

* Kings xiii, 21, (Sept.:) ἥψατο τῶν ὀστῶν Ἐλισαιέ, καὶ ἔζησε καὶ ἔστη ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας. Compare the apochryphal book Jesus Sirach, (Ecclesiasticus) xviii. 13, 14; xlix, 12.

† Plutarch, in his Life of Theseus, c. xxxvi.

by Tertullian, favored by the Apostles' Creed,* but pressed by some Church teachers, like Epiphanius and Jerome, in a grossly materialistic manner, without regard to the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* of Paul, and the declaration that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."† The latter theory was far the more consonant with the prevailing spirit of our period, entirely supplanted the other, and gave the mortal remains of the saints a higher value, and the worship of them a firmer foundation.

Roman Catholic historians and apologists find a justification of the worship and the healing virtue of relics in three facts of the New Testament: the healing of the woman with the issue of blood by the touch of Jesus's garment, (Matt. ix, 20;) the healing of the sick by the shadow of Peter, (Acts v, 14, 15;) and the same by handkerchiefs from Paul, (Acts xix, 11, 12.) These examples, as well as the miracle wrought by the bones of Elisha, were cited by Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and other Fathers, to vindicate similar and greater miracles in their time. They certainly mark the extreme limit of the miraculous, beyond which it passes into the magical. But in all these cases the living and present person was the vehicle of the healing power; in the second case Luke records merely the popular belief, not the actual healing; and, finally, neither Christ, nor the apostles themselves, chose that method, nor in any way sanctioned the superstitions on which it was based.‡ At all events the New Testament and the literature of the apostolic Fathers know

* In the phrase *ἀνάστασις τῆς σαρκός*, instead of *τοῦ σώματος*, resurrectio *carnis*, instead of *corporis*. The Nicene Creed uses the expression *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, resurrectio *mortuorum*. In the German version of the Apostles' Creed the easily mistaken term *fleisch, flesh*, is retained; but the English Churches say more correctly, resurrection of the *body*.

† Jerome, on the ground of his false translation of Job xix, 26, teaches even the restoration of all bones, veins, nerves, teeth, and hair, (because the Bible speaks of gnashing of teeth among the damned, and of the hairs of our heads being all numbered!) "Habent dentes," says he of the resurrection bodies, "ventrem, genitalia, et tamen nec cibis nec uxoribus indigent." Augustine is more cautious, and endeavors to avoid gross, carnal conceptions. (Compare the passages in Hagenbach's Dogmengeschichte, I, § 140, Engl. ed., N. Y., i, p. 370 sqq.)

‡ On the contrary, the account of the healing of sick by the handkerchiefs of Paul is immediately followed by an account of the magical abuse of the name of Jesus, as a warning. (Acts, xix, 13, etc.)

nothing of an idolatrous veneration of the cross of Christ, or the bones and chattels of the apostles. The living words and acts of Christ and the apostles so completely absorbed attention that we have no authentic accounts of the bodily appearance, the incidental externals, and transient possessions of the founders of the Church. Paul would know Christ after the Spirit, not after the flesh. Even the burial places of most of the apostles and evangelists are unknown. The traditions of their martyrdom and their remains date from a much later time, and can claim no historical credibility.

The first clear traces of the worship of relics appear in the second century, in the Church of Antioch, where the bones of the bishop and martyr Ignatius (who died A. D. 107) were preserved as a priceless treasure,* and in Smyrna, where the half-burnt bones of Polycarp (who died A. D. 167) were considered "more precious than the richest jewels and more tried than gold."† We read similar things in the Acts of the martyrs Perpetua and Cyprian. The author of the Apostolic Constitutions‡ exhorts that the relics of the saints, who are with the God of the living and not the dead, be held in honor, and appeals to the miracle of the bones of Elisha, to the veneration which Joseph showed for the remains of Jacob, and to the bringing of the bones of Joseph by Moses and Joshua into the promised land.§ Eusebius states that the episcopal throne of James of Jerusalem was preserved to his time, and was held in great honor.‖

Such pious fondness for relics, however, if it is confined within proper limits, is very natural and innocent, and appears even in the Puritans of New England, where the rock in Plymouth, the landing-place of the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620, has the attraction of a place of pilgrimage; and the chair of the first governor of Massachusetts is scrupulously

* Θησαυρὸς ἀτίμητος. Martyr. S. Ignat., cap. vii, (Patrum Apostolic. Opera, ed. Dressel, p. 214.) The genuineness of the Martyr-Acts of Ignatius, however, is disputed by many.

† Τὰ τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίον ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ. Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de Martyr. S. Polyc. c. 18,(ed. Dressel, p. 404,) and in Euseb. H. E. iv, 15.

‡ Const. Apost., lib. vi, c. 30. The sixth book dates from the end of the third century.

§ Compare Gen. l, 1, 2, 25, 26; Exod. xiii, 19; Josh. xxiv, 32; Acts vii, 16.

‖ Hist. Eccl., vii, 19 and 32.

preserved, and is used at the inauguration of every new president of Harvard University.

But toward the middle of the fourth century the veneration of relics, simultaneously with the worship of the saints, assumed a decidedly superstitious and idolatrous character. The earthy remains of the martyrs were discovered commonly by visions and revelations, often not till centuries after their death, then borne in solemn processions to the churches and chapels erected to their memory, and deposited under the altar;* and this event was annually celebrated by a festival.† The legend of the discovery of the holy cross gave rise to two Church festivals: the *Feast of the Invention of the Cross*,‡ on the 3d of May, which has been observed in the Latin Church since the fifth or sixth century; and the *Feast of the Elevation of the Cross*,§ on the 14th of September, which has been observed in the East and the West, according to some, since the consecration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in 335; according to others, only since the reconquest of the holy cross by the Emperor Heraclius in 628. The relics were from time to time displayed to the veneration of the believing multitude, carried about in procession, preserved in golden and silver boxes, worn on the neck as amulets against disease and danger of every kind, and considered as possessing miraculous virtue, or more strictly, as instruments through which the saints in heaven, in virtue of their connection with Christ, wrought miracles of healing, and even of raising the dead. Their number soon reached the incredible, even from one and the same original. There were, for example, countless splinters of the pretended cross of Christ from Jerusalem, while the cross itself is said to have remained, by a continual miracle, whole and undiminished! Veneration of the cross and crucifix knew no bounds, but can by no means be taken as a true measure of the worship of the Crucified; on the contrary, with the great mass, the outward form came into the place of the spiritual intent, and the wooden and silver Christ was very

* With reference to Revelation vi, 9: "I saw under the altar (ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) the souls of them that were slain for the word of God," etc.

† Festum translationis.

‡ Festum inventionis s. crucis.

§ Festum exaltationis s. crucis σταυροφανεία.

often a poor substitute for the living Christ in the heart. What Luther says of the "juggleries and idolatries" of the cross under the later Papacy, which "would rather bear the cross of Christ in silver, than in heart and life," applies, though of course with many noble exceptions, even to the Nicene age. Dr. Herzog, in his Theol. Encyclopædia, vol. viii, p. 60, sq., makes the not unjust remark: "The more the cross came into use in manifold forms and signs, the more the truly evangelical faith in Christ, the Crucified, disappeared. The more the cross of Christ was outwardly exhibited, the more it became inwardly an offense and folly to men. The Roman Catholic Church in this respect resembles those Christians who talk so much of their spiritual experiences, make so much ado about them, that they at last talk themselves out, and produce glittering nonsense."

Relics became a regular article of trade, but gave occasion also for very many frauds, which even such credulous and superstitious relic-worshipers as St. Martin of Tours* and Gregory the Great† lamented. Theodosius I., as early as 386, prohibited this trade, and so did many councils; but without success. On this account the bishops found themselves compelled to prove the genuineness of the relics by historical tradition, or visions, or miracles.

At first an opposition arose to this worship of dead men's bones. St. Anthony, the father of monasticism, (A. D. 356,) put in his dying protest against it, directing that his body should be buried in an unknown place. Athanasius relates this with approbation,‡ and he caused several relics which had been given to him to be fastened up that they might be out of the reach of idolatry.§ But the opposition soon ceased, or became confined to inferior or heretical authors like Vigilantius and Eunomius, or to heathen opponents like Porphyry and Julian. Julian charged the Christians on this point with apostasy

* Sulpit. Severus, Vita beati Mart., c. 11.

† Epist. lib. iv., ep. 30. Gregory here relates that some Greek monks came to Rome to dig up bones near St. Paul's Church to sell, as they themselves confessed, for holy relics, in the East, (confessi sunt, quod illa ossa ad Græciam essent tamquam Sanctorum reliquias portaturi.)

‡ In his Vita Antonii, Opera Athan. II, 502.

§ Rufinus, Hist. Eccl. II, 23.

from their own Master, and sarcastically reminds them of his denunciation of the Pharisees, who were like whited sepulchres, beautiful without, but within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.* This opposition of course made no impression, and was attributed to sheer impiety. Even heretics and schismatics, with few exceptions, embrace this form of superstition, though the Catholic Church denied the genuineness of their relics and the miraculous virtue of them.

The most and the best of the later Church Fathers, such as Hilary, the two Gregories, Basil, Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium, Theodoret, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Leo, even those who combated the worship of images, on this point were carried along by the spirit of the time, and gave the weight of their countenance to the worship of relics, which thus became henceforth an essential constituent of the Roman Catholic religion. They went quite as far as the Council of Trent,† which expresses itself more cautiously, on the worship of relics as well as of saints, than the Church Fathers of the Nicene age. With the good intent to promote popular piety by sensible stimulants and tangible supports, they became promoters of dangerous errors and gross superstition. To cite some of the most important testimony:

Gregory Nazianzen thinks the bodies of the saints can as well perform miracles as their spirits, and that the smallest parts of the body or of the symbols of their passion, are as efficacious as the whole body.‡ Chrysostom values the dust and ashes of the martyrs more highly than gold or jewels, and ascribes to them the power of healing diseases and putting death to flight.§ In his festal discourse on the translation of the relics of the Egyptian martyrs from Alexandria to Constantinople, he extols the bodies of the saints in eloquent strains as the best ramparts of the city against all visible enemies and invisible demons, mightier than walls, moats, weapons, and armies.‖ "Let others," says Ambrose, "heap up silver and gold; we gather the nails wherewith the martyrs were pierced, and their

* Cyrillus Alex., Adv. Jul. lib. x, tom. vi, p. 356.
† Sessio XXV. De Invocat. Sanct., etc.
‡ Adv. Julian, tom. i. Orat. III, p. 76 sq.
§ Opera, tom. ii., p. 828.
‖ Hom. in MM. Ægypt, tom. ii., p. 834 sq.

victorious blood, and the wood of their cross." * He himself relates at large, in a letter to his sister, the miraculous discovery of the bones of the twin brothers Gervasius and Protasius, two otherwise wholly unknown and long-forgotten martyrs of the persecution under Nero or Domitian.† This is one of the most notorious relic miracles of the early Church. It is attested by the most weighty authorities, by Ambrose and his younger contemporaries, his secretary and biographer Paulinus, the Bishop Paulinus of Nola, and Augustine, who was then in Milan; it decided the victory of the Nicene orthodoxy over the Arian opposition of the Empress Justina; yet is it very difficult to be believed, and seems, at least in part, to rest on pious frauds.‡ The story as to its principal features is this: When Ambrose, in 386, wished to consecrate the basilica at Milan, he was led by a higher intimation in a vision to cause the ground before the doors of Saints Felix and Nabor to be dug up, and there he found two corpses of uncommon size, the heads severed from the bodies, (for they died by the sword,) the bones perfectly preserved, together with a great quantity of fresh blood.§ These were the saints in question. They were exposed for two days to the wondering multitude, then borne in solemn procession to the basilica of Ambrose, performing on the way the healing of a blind man, Severus by

* Exhort. Virgin. 1.

† Epist. XXII, Sorori suæ, Op. II., 874–8. Comp. Paulinus, Vit. Ambros., p. 4; Paulinus Nol. Ep. XII., ad Severum; and Augustine in sundry places, (see below.)

‡ Clericus, Mosheim, and Isaac Taylor (vol. ii, p. 242 sqq.) do not hesitate to charge St. Ambrose, the author of the Te Deum, with fraud in this story. The latter, however, endeavors to save the character of Ambrose by distinguishing between himself and the spirit of his age. "Ambrose," says he, (ii., 270,) "occupies a high position among the fathers; and there was a vigor and dignity in his character, as well as a vivid intelligence, which must command respect; but in proportion as we assign praise to the man individually, we condemn the system which could so far vitiate a noble mind, and impel one so lofty in temper to act a part which heathen philosophers would utterly have abhorred."

§ Invenimus miræ magnitudinis viros duos, ut prisca ætas ferebat, ossa omnia integra, sanguinis plurimum! Did Ambrose really believe that men in the first century (prisca ætas) were of greater bodily stature than his contemporaries in the fourth? But especially absurd is the mass of fresh blood, which then was exported throughout Christendom as a panacea. According to Catholic tradition the blood of many saints, as of Januarius, in Naples, became liquid every year. Taylor thinks the miraculously healed Severus, by trade a butcher, had something to do with this blood.

name, a butcher by trade, and afterward sexton of this church. This, however, was not the only miracle which the bones performed. "The age of miracles returned," says Ambrose. "How many pieces of linen, how many portions of dress, were cast upon the holy relics and were recovered with the power of healing from that touch.* It is a source of joy to all to touch but the extremest portion of the linen that covers them, and whoso touches is healed. We give thee thanks, O Lord Jesus, that thou hast stirred up the energies of the holy martyrs at this time, wherein thy Church has need of stronger defense. Let all learn what combatants I seek, who are able to contend for us, but who do not assail us; who minister good to all, harm to none." In his homily "De Inventione SS. Gervasii et Protasii," he vindicates the miracle of the healing of the blind man against the doubts of the Arians, and speaks of it as a universally acknowledged and undeniable fact: "The healed man Severus is well known, and publicly testifies that he received his sight by the contact of the covering of the holy relics."

Jerome calls Vigilantius, for his opposition to the idolatrous veneration of ashes and bones, a wretched man, whose condition cannot be sufficiently pitied, a Samaritan and Jew, who considered the dead unclean; but he protects himself against the charge of superstition. "We honor the relics of the martyrs," says he, "that we may adore the God of the martyrs; we honor the servants, in order thereby to honor the Master, who has said, 'He that receiveth you, receiveth me.'† The saints are not dead; for the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is not a God of the dead, but of the living. Neither are they inclosed in Abraham's bosom as in a prison till the day of judgment, but they follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth."‡

Augustine believed in the above-mentioned miraculous discovery of the bodies of Gervasius and Protasius, and the healing of the blind man by contact with them, because he himself was then in Milan in 386, at the time of his conversion,§ and was an eye-witness, not indeed of the discovery

* Et tactu ipso medicabilia reposcuntur.
† Ep. CIX, ad Riparium.
‡ Adv. Vigil. c. vi.
§ Cum illic—Mediolani—essemus.

of the bones, for this he nowhere says, but of the miracles, and of the great stir among the people.*

He gave credit likewise to the many miraculous cures which the bones of the first martyr Stephen are said to have performed in various parts of Africa in his time.† These relics were discovered in 415, nearly four centuries after the stoning of Stephen, in an obscure hamlet near Jerusalem, through a vision of Gamaliel, by a priest of Lucian; and some years afterward, portions of them were transported to Uzali, not far from Utica, in North Africa, and to Spain and Gaul, and everywhere caused the greatest ado in the superstitious populace.

But Augustine laments, on the other hand, the trade in real and fictitious relics which was driven in his day,‡ and holds the miracles to be really superfluous now that the world is converted to Christianity, so that he who still demands miracles is himself a miracle.§ Though he adds, that to that day miracles were performed in the name of Jesus by the sacraments or by the saints, but not with the same luster, nor with the same significance and authority for the whole Christian world.‖ Thus he himself furnishes a warrant and an entering-wedge for critical doubt in our estimate of those phenomena.

* He speaks of these times clearly and plainly, Confess. IX. 7; De Civit. Dei XXII. 8; Serm. 286 in Natali MM. Protasii and Gervasii.

† Serm. 317 and 318 de Martyr. Steph. Isaac Taylor (L. c. ii, pp. 316–350) has thoroughly investigated the legend of the relics of the proto-martyr, and comes to the conclusion that it likewise rests on pious frauds which Augustine honestly believed.

‡ De opere Monachorum, c. xxviii: "Tam multos hypocritas sub habitu monæhorum [hostis] usquequoque dispersit, circumeuntes provincias, nusquam missos, nusquam fixos, nusquam stantes, nusquam sedentes. Alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrum, venditant."

§ De Civit. Dei, XXII, c. viii: "Cur, inquiunt, nunc illa miracula, quæ prædicatis facta esse, non fiunt? Possem quidem dicere, necessaria fuisse priusquam crederet mundus, ad hoc ut crederet mundus. Quisvis adhuc prodigia ut credat inquirit, magnum est ipse prodigium, qui mundo credente non credit."

‖ Ibid.: "Nam etiam nunc fiunt miracula in ejus nomine, sive per sacramenta ejus, sive per orationes vel memorias sanctorum ejus; sed *non eadem charitate* illustrantur, ut tanta quanta illa gloria diffamentur. . . . Nam plerumque etiam ibi [in the place where these miracles were wrought] *paucissimi* sciunt, ignorantibus cæteris, maxime si magna sit civitas; et quando alibi, aliiusque narrantur, *non tanta ea commendat auctoritas, ut sine difficultate vel dubitatione credantur* quamvis Christianis fidelibus a fidelibus indicentur." Then follows the account of the famous *miraculum Protasii et Gervasii*, and of several cures in Carthage and Hippo. Those in Hippo were wrought by the relics of St. Stephen, and formally confirmed.

This leads us to make, in conclusion, some general observations on the *character and credibility of the Catholic miracles.* This interesting and difficult subject has been recently discussed again during the Tractarian Controversy in England; on the affirmative side especially by John H. Newman, (now a Romish priest, then a Romanizing Anglican,) in his "Essay on Miracles" (in the first volume of the "English Translation of Fleury's Ecclesiastical History," Oxford, 1842;) on the negative side by Isaac Taylor (Independent,) in his interesting work, "Ancient Christianity," London, fourth edition, 1844, vol. ii, pages 233–365, (against the Oxford Tractarianism.) Compare also an article by Henry Rogers in the "Edinburgh Review," for 1844, and in the second volume of his Essays. Dr. Newman previously took the negative side on the question of the genuineness of the Church miracles in a contribution to the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana," 1830. The doctrine of St. Augustine on miracles has been most thoroughly investigated by Prof. Nitsch, jun., of Berlin, in an instructive monograph, published 1865 under the title: "*Die Lehre Augustin vom Wunder.*"

In the face of such witnesses as Ambrose and Augustine, who must be accounted, in any event, the noblest and most honorable men of the early Church, it is venturesome absolutely to deny all the relic-miracles, and to ascribe them to illusion and pious fraud. But, on the other hand, we should not be bribed or blinded by the character and authority of such witnesses, since experience sufficiently proves that even the best and most enlightened men cannot wholly divest themselves of superstition and of the prejudices of their age.* Hence, too, we should not ascribe to this whole question of the credibility of the Nicene miracles an undue dogmatic weight, nor make the much wider issue between Catholicism and Protestantism dependent on it.† In every age, as in every man, light and shade in fact are mingled, that no flesh should

* Recall, for example, Luther and the apparitions of the devil, the Magnalia of Cotton Mather, and the old Puritans and their trials for witchcraft, as well as the modern superstitions of spirit-rappings and table-turnings, by which many eminent and intelligent persons have been carried along.

† As is done by many Roman Catholic historians and apologists in the cause of Catholicism, and by Isaac Taylor in the interest of Protestantism. The latter says, in his oft-quoted work on Ancient Christianity, volume ii, page 239: "The

exalt itself above measure. Even the most important periods of Church history, among which the Nicene age, with all its faults, must be numbered, have the heavenly treasure in earthen vessels, and reflect the spotless glory of the Redeemer in broken colors.

The most notorious and the most striking of the miracles of the Nicene age are Constantine's vision of the cross, (A. D. 312,) the finding of the holy cross, (A. D. 326,) the frustration of Julian's building of the temple, (A. D. 363,) the discovery of the relics of Protasius and Gervasius, (A. D. 386,) and subsequently (A. D. 415) of the bones of St. Stephen, with a countless multitude of miraculous cures in its train. We here offer some general remarks on this difficult subject.

The possibility of miracles in general he only can deny who does not believe in a living God and Almighty Maker of heaven and earth. The laws of nature are organs of the free will of God; not chains by which he has bound himself forever, but elastic threads, which he can extend and contract at his pleasure. The actual occurrence of miracles is certain to every believer, from Holy Scripture, and there is no passage in the New Testament to limit it to the apostolic age. The reasons which made miracles necessary, as outward proofs of

question before us [on the genuineness of the Nicene miracles] is therefore in the strictest sense *conclusive* as to the modern controversy concerning Church principles and the authority of tradition. If the miracles of the fourth century, and those which follow in the same track, were real, then Protestantism is altogether indefensible, and ought to be denounced as an impiety of the most flagrant kind. But if these miracles were wicked frauds, and if they were the first series of a system of impious delusion, then not only is the modern Papacy to be condemned, but the Church of the fourth century must be condemned with it, and for the same reason; and the Reformation is to be adhered to as the emancipation of Christendom from the thraldom of him who is the 'father of lies.'" Taylor accordingly sees in the old Catholic miracles sheer lying wonders of Satan, and signs of the apostasy of the Church predicted in the Epistles of St. Paul. From the same point of view he treats also the phenomena of asceticism and monasticism, putting them with the unchristian hatred of the creature and the ascription of nature to the devil, which characterized the Gnostics. But he thus involves not only the Nicene age, but the ante-Nicene also, up to Irenæus and Ignatius, in this apostasy, and virtually gives up the unbroken continuity of true Christianity. He is, moreover, not consistent, in making the Church Fathers on the one hand the chief originators of monkish asceticism and false miracles, while on the other hand he sincerely reveres them and eloquently lauds them for their Christian earnestness and their immortal services. (Compare his beautiful Concession in vol. i, p. 37.)

the divine mission of Christ and the apostles, for the unbelieving Jews of their time, may reappear from time to time in the unbelieving heathen and the skeptical Christian world; while spiritual miracles are continually taking place in regeneration and conversion. In itself, it is by no means unworthy and incredible that God should sometimes condescend to the weakness of the uneducated mass, and should actually vouchsafe that which was implored through the mediation of saints and their relics.

But the following weighty considerations rise against the miracles of the Nicene and the whole middle age; not warranting, indeed, the rejection of all, yet making us at least very cautious and doubtful of receiving them in particular:

1. These miracles have a much lower moral tone than those of the Bible, while in some cases they far exceed them in outward pomp, and make a stronger appeal to our faculty of belief. Many of the monkish miracles are not so much *super*natural and *above* reason, as they are *un*natural and *against* reason, attributing even to wild beasts of the desert, panthers and hyenas, with which the misanthropic hermits lived on confidential terms, moral feelings and states, repentance and conversion, of which no trace appears in the New Testament.*

2. They serve not to confirm the Christian faith in general, but for the most part to support the ascetic life, the magical virtue of the sacrament, the veneration of saints and relics, and other superstitious practices, which are evidently of later origin, and are more or less offensive to the healthy evangelical mind.†

* The speaking serpent in Paradise, (Gen. iii,) and the speaking ass of Balaam, (Num. xxii, 22, 23; compare 2 Pet. ii, 16,) can hardly be cited as analogies, since in those cases the irrational beast is merely the organ of a moral power foreign to him.

† Isaac Taylor, "Ancient Christianity," vol. ii, p. 235, says of the miracles of the Nicene age: "These alleged miracles were *almost in every instance* wrought expressly in support of those very practices and opinions which stand forward as the points of contrast, distinguishing Romanism from Protestantism: . . . the supernatural properties of the eucharistic elements; the invocation of saints, or direct praying to them, and the efficacy of their relics; and the reverence or worship due to certain visible and palpable religious symbols." Historical questions, however, should be investigated and decided with all possible freedom from confessional prejudices.

3. The further they are removed from the apostolic age the more numerous they are, and in the fourth century alone there are more miracles than in all the three preceding centuries together, while the reason for them, as against the power of the heathen world, was less.

4. The Church Fathers, with all the worthiness of their character in other respects, confessedly lacked a very highly cultivated sense of truth, and allowed a certain justification of falsehood *ad majorem, Dei gloriam*, or *fraus pia*, under the misnomer of policy or accommodation;* with the solitary exception of Augustine, who, in advance of his age, rightly condemned falsehood in every form.

5. Several Church Fathers, like Augustine, Martin of Tours, and Gregory I., themselves concede that in their time extensive frauds with the relics of saints were already practiced; and this is confirmed by the fact that there were not rarely numerous copies of the same relics, all of which claimed to be genuine.

6. The Nicene miracles met with doubt and contradiction even among contemporaries; and Sulpitius Severus makes the important admission that the miracles of St. Martin were better known and more firmly believed in foreign countries than in his own.†

7. Church Fathers like Chrysostom and Augustine, contradict themselves, in a measure, in sometimes paying homage to the prevailing faith in miracles, especially in their discourses on the festivals of the martyrs, and in soberer moments, and in the calm exposition of the Scriptures, maintaining that miracles, at least in the biblical sense, had long since ceased.

* So especially Jerome, Epist. ad Pammachium esse γυμναστικῶς scribere, aliud δογματικῶς. In priori vagam esse disputationem; et adversario respondentem, nunc hæc nunc illa proponere, argumentari ut libet, aliud loqui, aliud agere, panem, ut dicitur, ostendere, lapidem tenere. In sequenti autem aperta frons et, ut ita dicam, ingenuitas necessaria est. Of interest, in this connection, is his controversy with Augustine on the conduct of Paul toward Peter, (Gal. ii, 11,) which Jerome would attribute to mere policy or accommodation. Even Chrysostom utters loose principles on the duty of veracity, (De Sacerdot. I. 5,) and his pupil Cassian still more, appealing to the example of Rahab. (Coll. XVII, 8, 17, etc.) Compare Gieseler, I, ii, p. 307, (§ cii, note 17.) The corrupt principle that "the end sanctifies the means" is much older than Jesuitism, which is commonly made responsible for it. Christianity had at that time not yet wholly overcome the spirit of falsehood in ancient heathenism.

† Dialog., I. 18.

This argument is prominently employed by James Craigie Robertson, moderate Anglican: History of the Christian Church to Gregory the Great. London, 1854, page 334. "On the subject of miracles," says he, "there is a remarkable inconsistency in the statements of writers belonging to the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries. St. Chrysostom speaks of it as a notorious and long-settled fact that miracles had ceased." (*v.* Newman, in Fleury, vol. i, p. 39.) Yet at that very time, St. Martin, St. Ambrose, and the monks of Egypt and the East are said to have been in full thaumaturgical activity; and Sozomen (VIII. 5) tells a story of a change of the eucharistic bread into a stone as having happened at Constantinople while Chrysostom himself was bishop. So, again, St. Augustine says that miracles, such as those of Scripture, were no longer done, yet he immediately goes on to reckon up a number of miracles which had lately taken place, apparently without exciting much sensation, and among them *seventy* formally attested ones, wrought at Hippo alone, within two years, by the relics of St. Stephen. (De Civit. Dei, XXII, 8, 1, 20.) "On the whole, while I would not deny that miracles may have been wrought after the times of the apostles and their associates, I can find very little satisfaction in the particular instances which are given."

We must, moreover, remember that the rejection of the Nicene miracles by no means justifies the inference of intentional deception in every case, nor destroys the claim of the great Church teachers to our respect. On the contrary, between the proper miracle and fraud there lie many intermediate steps of self-deception, clairvoyance, magnetic phenomena and cures, and unusual states of the human soul, which is full of deep mysteries, and stands nearer the invisible spirit-world than the every-day mind of the multitude suspects. Constantine's vision of the cross, for example, may be traced to a prophetic dream, and the frustration of the building of the Jewish temple under Julian, to a special providence, or an historical judgment of God. The mytho-poetic faculty, too, which freely and unceremoniously produces miracles among children, may have been at work among credulous monks in the dreary deserts, and magnified an ordinary event into a miracle. In judging of this obscure portion of the

history of the Church, we must in general guard ourselves as well against shallow naturalism and skepticism, as against superstitious mysticism, remembering that "there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy."

## Art. IV.—CHILDHOOD CONVERSION.

On no subject do the Holy Scriptures more clearly indicate the duty of parents and the Church than in reference to the religious education and culture of little children. Never did our Lord and his apostles speak more explicitly nor more tenderly than in reference to them, their relation to the kingdom of heaven, the pleasure of God respecting their early training, and our duty to provide for and secure their religious and spiritual welfare. "Take heed," says our Lord, "that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." "All thy children," says Isaiah, "shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children." "Parents," writes St. Paul, "bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

These injunctions accord with the evident indications of the will of God wherever and whenever he has spoken on this subject. To the young, God says, "My son, give me thy heart." "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy *youth*." "Those that seek me early shall find me." To parents and guardians he says, "Train up a child in the way he should go"—catechise a child at the opening of the way he should go—"and when he is old he will not depart from it." This is the rule; to it there may be exceptions: "These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." The impartation of heart-truths will be in affection and in earnest.

The covenant relation of children to the kingdom of heaven, to the Church and her visible ordinances, is beautifully enunciated by the Saviour: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and by St. Peter: "Be baptized every one of you in

the name of Jesus Christ; for the promise is unto you and to your children." In reference to "little ones" of such tender age as to be *brought* to him, our Lord openly and personally manifested such attentions and taught such lessons as gave his disciples to understand that even they themselves, mature, chosen, and daily subject to his instructions, must become, would they enter the kingdom of heaven, like the little child then placed in their midst. And then, encouraging all parents to bring their little ones to him, he took into his arms those brought to him, put his hands upon them, and blessed them. Referring to the tender care of a shepherd for each and all his flock, by going even to the mountains for one estrayed, he adds, ".Even so, it is not the will of your Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish."

You see, therefore, that our subject possesses the full share of importance that we attach to topics of more frequent discussion and more earnest efforts.

Our first thought is, *Children are in danger of perishing.* By this, however, is not meant that such as die in early and irresponsible childhood, before they reach the condition of actual sin, shall perish. No, no. I do not believe with a certain divine of my acquaintance that, as young rattlesnakes possess the deadly poison of their progenitors, and may therefore be innocently killed, even before they have done harm, so little and harmless children deserve damnation, and are saved if any and at all, only because of their special election in and through the lineal election of their believing parents. Not only are they among the redeemed, but they all both belong to and are *of* the kingdom of heaven. They possess the character requisite to enter the kingdom. Few truths are more clearly taught in the divine Scriptures than that little children, in virtue of the atonement, sustain a justified relation to God. "The free gift has come upon all men unto justification of life." "For as by one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall the many be made righteous."

Let it be noted also that if those in maturity become, on their conversion, as little children, and, through a personal faith in the atonement, sustain a similar relation to God and

his Church, then children themselves, dying in this relation and state, are saved without personal faith. *They* are in no danger of perishing.

Neither do I mean that, growing up to responsibility, children may pursue such a course of life and form such a character as will lead to spiritual ruin. This is abundantly evident and universally conceded. The Bible teaches it. The history of man confirms it.

I mean rather that little children, because of the neglect and evil example of parents and guardians, and the omissions of the Church, may be left to receive those impressions, take in those ideas, and form those habits that will lead them early to sin, will develop and strengthen a perverse character, and end in the perdition of ungodly men. Beginning in childhood, they may receive such influences and instructions, may embrace such principles, as will lead them to looseness of thought and habits, and then to vice and ruin. This is the probable result if we permit them, under the force of their keenly watchful, impulsive, and curiously inquisitive minds, to select for themselves, to take their own course; or, if careless of their early amusements, attachments, associations, and habits, because we judge that early impressions, new and forceful, are soon lost, or are modified for the better, we wrongly think they will soon outgrow the errors of childhood; or, again, that their early biases to evil will not greatly influence their future character or habits. It is a remark of Lord Brougham, that children learn more the first eighteen months than during the same length of time in any subsequent period of life, because they then receive the germs of thought and feeling. Then mind is more impressible, memory more tenacious, and the heart, like spring-flowers, is more fully open to surrounding influences. Evil habits then formed, or impressions then received, are not easily outgrown or corrected. The future of life, during which we may delusively hope for their reform, takes on the character of all the more prominent and forceful biases of neglected and badly-educated childhood. As a channel, opened in the surface sand by the stick of a sportive boy, directs the course of a rivulet, so the increasing stream and river run on.

"Just as the twig is bent the tree inclines."

The course of early maturing childhood may terminate in ruin.

2. Now it may be asked, Why is it that children, unless carefully guarded, wisely educated, and religiously nurtured, are in danger of perishing? The answer is: Because of the moral disease that in a latent state—only now and then in early childhood developing clearly discernible, at least, noticeable symptoms—infects the soul; a disease that is aggravated by parental indifference and wrong, sometimes by gleeful encouragement, (as if innocent,) and by contact with a vain, proud, wicked world. I mean what is called "original sin," "depravity," "the corruption naturally engendered of fallen Adam." Even in the justified and sinless relation of childhood, there is in embryo, and ready to take root, a seed of death. But it may be counteracted and overcome. The youngest children are redeemed and justified. Thus early "a portion of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." Deep within the human soul is an embryo of life. Its gracious unfoldings, belonging to the economy of grace, are favorable to its development; and by care on our part in their application they may be made more so. Though the good and the evil, of which we speak, struggle early and long for an ascendency, yet at and in regeneration the germ of life shoots forth, and, under the showers of grace and the light of truth, grows into new and stronger vigor.

But this abnormal state of the soul, these inclinings to evil, may, either from neglect or by evil teaching, be aggravated and increased. Evil influences, of whatever force and power, may be early felt. Unfavorable habits may be early formed. Sinful associations and alliances may be early entered into. With all, and however young, there is a predisposition to evil that in early life may and should be counteracted and overcome. So strong is this tendency to evil, this proclivity to sin, or what may eventuate in sin, that, could we withdraw an infant child from all external evil influences, whether of example or of precept, so that it would be wholly and absolutely by itself, it would be evil in its tendencies, and in due time would show forth traits of depravity and an aptitude to sin rather than to holiness. This, however, is not because of the original and abstract nature of the soul, nor for the want

of redemption, nor from the absence of gracious influences; but because of the inherited, and, therefore, *really* abnormal condition or *depravity* of which, in his Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul truthfully and forcibly writes.

But this supposed case is not the condition of childhood. Instead of being in utter and blank solitude, it is early met by a flood of influences. Some are good, others are evil. The inward inclinings and the outward drawings and motives to evil early meet and easily overcome the child. Could the equally early wooings of divine grace be joined in by holy surroundings and by religious teachings, all our children would be effectually taught of the Lord, and great would be their peace. Though fallen and corrupted, childhood is innocent; though unfortunate, it is not guilty; though alien, it is not disowned. Though through the offense of one it is dead, yet through the grace of God, and the gift by grace, it is alive. The Lamb of God has taken away the *sin of the world*, that is the condemnation entailed by the fall—what cannot in any proper sense be termed personal and individual sins, but rather the world-sin. As a misfortune, depravity remains. As a free gift, justification unto life is a fact. This life in Christ it is our business to cherish and develop. Give to it favorable conditions and surroundings, and it will thrive, grow, and bear good fruit. Our work is to educate. God's work is to bless and to save. To nurture and admonish in the Lord is our labor. To render this our labor effectual, is what God promises to do. As the Egyptian princess said to the mother of Moses, to whom she providentially intrusted him, so God says to each of us who has the care and training of children, "Take this child, and bring him up for me."

Though, in the sense now defined, our little children are in danger of perishing, yet *they may and ought to be saved*, which is our second proposition.

By this, however, is not meant that only *some* infants, say those of believing parents, having received baptism and dying in their innocence, that is, not having committed sin, shall be saved; for that *all* that die in early childhood will be saved is most abundantly and clearly taught in the Scriptures.

Nor do I mean that when grown to maturity, or having

reached the period of clear and distinct responsibility, they may then repent, believe, and be saved; for this also is the plain and oft-repeated teaching of revelation. "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," are not only possible, but are urged on all men.

But we *do* mean that *children may be so taught and directed that in all probability they will early become Christians, and, through the influence of religious training, and by a use of the means of grace, will be finally saved.* This initial salvation in Christ, succeeded by nurture and admonition in the Lord, will doubtless eventuate in regeneration and final salvation.

I entertain this opinion because they may be taught good, though not as easily, yet as certainly as they may be taught evil. Indeed, as the Bible teaches in the case of Samuel, Josiah, and Timothy, so the Church in *all ages* has had beautiful examples of early conversions. Our Lord says, "Whosoever shall offend one of *these little ones that believe in me*—" pointing to them at that time about him. Being susceptible of religious impressions, they may receive good and saving ones as truly as evil and corrupting. The delicate sensitive plant, yielding to the softest touch, is not more susceptible of material contact or influence than is the mind of early childhood to the softest touches of good or evil. Antedating the conscious approach of evil, the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men *teaching* them. Under the force of these earliest teachings the soul opens to divine monitions and impressions. Like a vine even amid the germs and roots of thorns, the soul of a child throws out its tendrils of emotion, of feeling, and of affection, that it may touch, cling to, and lean upon some sure support. It is for us to say to what it shall cling, upon what it shall lean. Or, to change the illustration, the soul of childhood, as every careful and unbiased observer may detect, opens its sensibilities to receive thoughts and ideas as truly (may I not say as naturally?) as does a green plant spread its leaves and open its flowers to evening dews and morning light. The God of nature and of grace has so designed and ordered.

Now these delicate susceptibilities demand that a careful education and sound religious influences, such as Christianity always engenders and promotes, be brought to bear, in an

attractive and pleasing form, on the soul of even a little child, and thence on to maturity. And where, and under what auspices, may this work be more effectually begun and wrought out than in the *family circle* and in the *Sunday-school*, which are the nurseries of the Church? Nurture and admonition in the Lord, and growth in grace and knowledge, are a life-work. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand."

Though what we call the natural proclivity of soul is to error and sin, and foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child, yet by the grace of God sound instruction, early begun and faithfully continued, may secure the high aims and designs of life. Our children may be saved. Not more delicate and impressible, under the soft and noiseless etchings of light, is the prepared plate of a photographist, than is the mind of childhood under the teachings of truth and grace. Our work is so to adjust the heart of the child to the power of divine light, in these galleries of grace, the Church, that the image of Christ shall be put upon and wrought within it.

2. Do we want evidences of the practicability of this? Take the word of God, where we find this doctrine taught, the requisite precepts, advices, and truths presented, the necessary encouragements afforded, and veritable examples of childhood piety, youthful constancy, and manhood nobleness given. Look at the beautiful character and history of Joseph, whose filial piety, youthful obedience, manly purity, and royal wisdom adorned his whole life; at Samuel, from the time his mother lent him to the Lord as long as he should live, up to his judgeship in Israel, and his venerable headship of the school of the prophets in Carmel; at Josiah, the boy-king, early purifying the Church and nation, and bringing back the customs of his sainted ancestry; at Jeremiah, inspired to be a prophet while yet a timid child; and at Timothy, who, though begotten of a Greek, yet, through the piety of his grandmother Lois, and the faithfulness of his mother Eunice, from a child knew the Scriptures that made him wise unto salvation. His conversion had not been so young, his ministry had not been so powerful, nor his life so pure, his spiritual discernment so clear, his religious symmetry so perfect, nor his episcopal office so dignified, had he not been early

and well instructed in the truth. What early religious instruction did for these and still others, it will, other things equal, do for yet other youth.

Since the introduction of the Sunday-school, an auxiliary to, and under the auspices and direction of the Church, having fully and fairly vindicated its adaptation to early instruction and piety, the number of conversions in childhood and youth has been greatly increased. Our Sunday-school statistics show that thousands are, through this agency, annually converted and added to the Church. And we judge that the future of the Church and of our country depends as greatly on the number and efficiency of Sunday-schools as on any other agency.

These general facts seem reasonable, and to harmonize with the laws of mind, as also to lie in the current of Revelation. Does the agriculturist wait until the virgin soil, sown in hope, is grown over with noxious weeds before he looks to the harvest? Does the shepherd wait indifferently until the tender and truant lambs of his flock have wandered to the rough mountains and jagged cliffs, before he calls them back or brings them in his arms to the fold? Does God's perfect plan of salvation design, or in any way imply, that we wait until these little ones of ours, prone to truancy, easily led to error, and inclined to evil, have gone to the bleak and verdureless desert of sin, to the wild and cold mountains of skepticism, or have been taken in the decoys of the devil, before we make any earnest efforts to teach and save them? O no! By his Spirit and favor God forestalls any outward evil. "The true Light lighteth every man that cometh into the world." And as "where sin abounded grace did much more abound," so this Light of the world shines into every soul *on its coming* into the world.

Beyond all question, it is the will of God that the children of Christian parents receive such instructions as will aid to their salvation. They, if any, are embraced in the terms of the covenant with Abraham and his seed forever. In virtue of the atonement, and of the relations of believing parents, they are said by the apostle Paul to be "holy," and entitled to the benefits of that relation. Christianity is the development of the covenant with the "father of the faithful." And the prophetic promises, running all through this book, secure

the same, even *greater* privileges, to the children of Christian parents. "The promise is to *you* and to *your children*."

Of Sir Joshua Reynolds it is said, that he seldom looked upon an inferior painting, lest it should unconsciously lower his standard of ideal conceptions, and in his own works he should reproduce the defects imaged on his mind. How carefully then should our children, whose young hearts are more susceptible to evil than is the mind of any artist to defects of genius, be guarded against the real evils and enormities of life! Our world is a vast amphitheater of ugliness and sin. The Church should be a grand and inviting gallery of beauties for the eye and heart of childhood. What scenes shall they first look upon? What tastes shall they form? What ideas shall they first take in? Shall they learn to love the truthful and divinely beautiful pictures of history, of saintly character, and of revelation here delineated? Or shall they become more familiar with and be corrupted by the coarse draftings and debasing scenes and characters of ungodly men and sin?

Once a gay young nobleman was passing through a gallery of art, when his eye was arrested by a picture of our Saviour suffering on the cross. Pausing to look, he read on the canvass, "This have I done for thee. What hast thou done for me?" The scene, interpreted by the underwriting, led to his conversion. Now that same world-scene—Jesus suffering, dying—is pictured in the child's great text-book, the Sunday-school's great Manual, in divinely-chosen words, so fully and skillfully, that the mind of the youngest can but be arrested and captivated by its awful and morally sublime beauties. The interpretation accompanies the divinely portrayed scene. "He suffered the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." I doubt whether any one, young or old, can get a clear and full view of this great central scene of the cross, illustrated and enforced by all the redemptive surroundings standing out from the dark and gloomy background of sin and guilt, without feeling moved to tears of penitence, to gratitude and adoration. To these pure and exalted emotions would Christian parents and the Sunday-school bring the children of the kingdom. No pictures are more beautiful nor attractive, even to the genius of the artist, than the historic,

moral, and divinely-tragic ones drawn in this Book of books. It is a revelation, not of *truths alone*, but of the grand workings and achievements of truths believed, *experienced*, *wrought out*, and REALIZED on earth and in heaven. With these things our children may be made familiar. The power of them they may feel. Belonging, by the right of redemption, to the kingdom of heaven, they should be secured to it. And somebody is at fault if they are not so secured.

Not only at home, what should be an earthly miniature of the heavenly, but in the Sunday-school, may begin the religious instruction of our little ones. So well arranged are the several apartments and departments of this institution, that instructions may be given from a very tender age to venerable years. From simple words in holy song, from easy and truthful lessons, from the power of example, and from Sabbath associations in this vestibule of the Church, they may take in beautiful ideas and sublime truths. As yet the general Church hardly knows the power and adaptations of divine truth on childhood mind. I know that some youth seem strangely averse to good and perverse in evil; and that parents are not always responsible for it. And yet could we clearly and always see the causes of error and of sin, did we know the remedies and understand how to apply them in every case, very few or none of the children of the Church would be lost.

From what we have now written, especially from the several Scripture citations we have made, it appears that *careful religious instruction* is the divinely-appointed method of securing the salvation of the children of the Church. Both the Old Testament, beginning with Abraham, in whom all nations are blessed, and running through the Mosaic provisions for childhood instruction, and the New Testament, beginning with the precepts and example of our Lord, and running through the definite instructions of the apostles, teach that the chief work of parents and of the Church is *to instruct the children*. And all faithful instruction will of course be accompanied by prayer, and such other appliances and ordinances as are suitable to the condition and adapted to the capacities of children. In further evidence of the correctness of this idea, we group together a few of the more prominent passages of Scripture that refer directly to this subject: "I know Abra-

ham, that he will *command his children and his household* after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." "These words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart: and thou *shalt teach them diligently unto thy children*, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." "He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers that they should *make them known to their children;* that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children; that they might set their hope in God, and forget not the works of God; but keep his commandments." "All thy children shall shall *be taught of the Lord;* and great shall be the peace of thy children." "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones. Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me," etc. "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." "Bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

In harmony with these definite instructions, the highest authority in the Methodist Episcopal Church teaches "that all children, by virtue of the unconditional benefits of the atonement, are members of the kingdom of God, and, therefore, graciously entitled to baptism; but as infant baptism contemplates a course of religious instruction and discipline, it is expected of all parents or guardians who present their children for baptism that they use all diligence in bringing them up in conformity to the word of God;" and, further, that "all children who have been baptized are placed in visible covenant relation to God, and are under the special watch-care and supervision of the Church;" and that "at the age of ten years, or earlier, the baptized children of the Church" shall be instructed "in the nature, design, and obligations of baptism, and the truths of religion necessary to make them wise unto salvation;" and, again, they shall be urged "to give reverent attendance upon the means of grace;" shall be advised, exhorted, and encouraged to "an immediate consecra-

tion of their hearts and lives to God," and then, as they give evidence of piety, they are to be admitted to membership in the Church.

The same authority ordains that parents shall see that their baptized children "be taught, as soon as they shall be able to learn, the nature and end of baptism;" that they "shall read the Holy Scriptures, learn the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the Catechism, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe in order that they may lead a virtuous and holy life.*

Now the question forces itself on the heart of pious parents and on the Church, How shall this work of childhood instruction, of "nurture and admonition in the Lord," be so performed as to result in the salvation of children? To this inquiry we briefly address our remaining remarks.

It is evident that teaching, both as to its matter and manner, should be adapted to the subjects—to *children;* to their situation or surroundings, *in a world of error and sin;* and to their *salvation.*

1. In the family and in the Church religious instruction should be adapted to the wants and capacities of children. In the good and wise providence of God this matter has been provided for. Children are intrusted to *parents*, who can and should have a tender and watchful care for them from their earliest openings of intelligence till they come to clear and distinct personal responsibility. Being natural guardians, they have an affection and solicitude which they alone can feel and exercise. Bound to their children by instincts and yearnings which they alone possess, they are made and held responsible for their education and training as no others are. As strongly indicated by the instincts of humanity—instincts that are deep, tender, and nearly irresistible, because natural—all Christian parents can but feel a special duty to educate their offspring for the higher and holier duties of life and for the fruitions of eternity. In the soul of every child there is unfolded the germ of all that a long and carefully educated life can develop, of all that eternity will unfold. And if, as God has provided

* To aid somewhat in this important work, Messrs. Carlton & Porter have published a "Manual of Instruction for Baptized Children," which covers the whole range of topics enjoined by the Church.

in the relations and loves of the family, the instruction of children shall be carefully and continuously attended to, if their tender hearts shall be brought to the light of the Gospel, shall be early opened and subjected to the gentle influences of divine grace, and shall be strongly guarded from the sinful and corrupting examples and teachings of the wicked by a green hedge-row of Christian truths and precepts, we see not why our sons shall not "be like plants grown up in their youth, and our daughters like stones polished after the similitude of a palace."

But should parents fail to regard their offspring as providentially committed to them for sound religious instruction, not only as clearly taught in the Bible, but as indicated by parental instincts and as urged by family ties, then *the Church of God* has a responsibility that should not be overlooked, that cannot be thrown off. Because they are redeemed by Him "of whom the whole family, in heaven and earth, is named;" and in virtue of their relationship to the kingdom of heaven, children are members of the true Church of Christ and under her watchcare. They are lambs of the fold, and God has ordained their feeding and protection. Christians, with hearts touched by a divine sympathy, feel for them, gather them into the nursery of the Church, and teaching them, they to some extent take the place of unchristian parents. The Church has always regarded the Sunday-school, or something very similar to it—for instance, catechumen classes—as a prominent means of educating children. Family instruction, and catechetical instruction under the direction of the Church, have ever been employed. The Sunday-school of modern times is pre-eminently suited to the character and capacities of children; to bring the great and life-giving truths of salvation to their apprehension, to teach them habits of reverence for the Sabbath, for the sanctuary, for the Church; and to put the laws of God unto their minds, and to write them on their hearts. Their text-book is the Bible. The reading put into their hands is designed to be suited to their capacities and wants.

The several departments of a model and efficient Sunday-school are so arranged as to take little children, induct them into a beautiful system of Bible instruction, and lead them

on for years until they shall become mature in judgment and well taught in the essential truths of Christianity. Youth is an interesting and commanding period of life. And the Scriptures are eloquent with precepts, invitations, promises, and warnings especially designed for them. To the world-wide provisions and invitations of the Gospel, God seems to have added others for the encouragement and salvation of *youth*, who alone are addressed by the royal counselor in these words: "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy *youth*." To them only does God say, "Those that seek me *early* shall find me." Impressions made on their minds not only strike the deepest but last the longest. Early acts of faith, confidings of hope, and thoughts of love, throw a bright and beautiful light on the pathway of life; and the first shadows of unbelief, error, and sin, cast a lengthened gloom along the path of bewildered youth and skeptical manhood.

2. Both in the family and in the Church, instruction should be adapted to *the situation* of children. They are surrounded by a vain and wicked world. Evils visible and invisible, audible and inaudible, tangible and intangible, literally throng them. In the street and in the house they make enduring impressions on their hearts. The world is full of sin, and, unless embosomed in parental solicitudes and guarded about by Christian teachings in all wisdom, our children will be corrupted and ruined. But should we get them interested in the Sunday-school we introduce them to associations morally healthful, and bring them under influences that are salutary and divine. If we may except the preaching of the word, there is no instrumentality better suited to usefulness, and really doing more to teach the young in reference to their salvation and in the direction of it, than is the Sunday-school, because of its adaptations to their situation and surroundings.

3. Religious teachings should be adapted to *the end to be secured*, namely, *the salvation of children*. It is a spiritual and religious work. The means used should be spiritual and religious. If we look at it in the light of the Scriptures and of experience, we shall see that the plan of God and of the Church, in the constitution of the family and in the adaptations of the Sunday-school, is wisely designed, and directed

to secure the Christian experience and final salvation of all the children of the Church. So far as human agency is involved, the enlargement and perpetuity of the Church depend on this work as truly as on any other. In the early history of American Methodism, before Sunday-schools became the active and efficient agency they now are, the conversion and Church-membership of children were lightly esteemed and unfrequent. Church enlargement was sought and attained rather by the conversion of adults, too often poorly instructed in the doctrines and duties of religion. By them errors were to be unlearned and corrected; evil habits were to be overcome; and the whole current of life had to be changed. But when, as now more than formerly, the divine mind is better understood and more fully carried out, the elements of a virtuous character are more early taught, the foundations of a Christian life are more deeply and firmly laid in childhood, and the relations of children to the kingdom of heaven are better appreciated, then shall we see the Church growing from within by a development of her embryo elements, both in numbers and in strength. This organic method of growth is not only taught in the Scriptures, but is according to the analogy of things in the family, in society, and even in nature.

It is highly gratifying and encouraging, that the largest Church organization in this country is beginning more fully to understand her duty in the work of childhood instruction and salvation. Her leading minds are looking at this subject as never before. Her wisest and most practical men are devising means and plans to make the work effective and general. As yet any systematic helps are few, and few are the wise and experienced laborers. When, however, the Church shall be fully awake both to the possibility of childhood conversion and to the best means of effecting it, then will it no longer be necessary for one to say to another, "Know thou the Lord; for all shall know him from the least even unto the greatest." The aims of our life-work and the height of our ambition should be, in the consummation of all duty, to say, "Here, Lord, are we and the children thou hast given us."

## Art. V.—VOLTAIRE.

Voltaire was born on the 20th of February, 1694. During his childhood he was the delight of his instructors, the Jesuits. Introduced into society by the Abbé de Châteauneuf he was early initiated into the elegancies of life and all the refinements of wit. In the midst of a circle of courtiers and epicurean abbés, his youth was all that could be expected—openly dissolute. At twenty he composed fugitive rhymes bearing the impress of the facile philosophy of Chanlieu, and competed for a prize offered by the Academy, in an ode on the decoration of Notre-Dame! This early education clung to him all his life; through his struggles, success, and fame, he retained till death a taste for trifles and elegant corruption.

The Regent rescued Voltaire from this dissipated life by sending him to the Bastille for a mischievous piece of verse which he did not write, thus procuring him his first leisure for meditation. When the young poet was set at liberty, after several months of captivity, he had written or composed the most beautiful pages of "Œdipus" and the "Henriad."

The enraptured public hailed the unknown youth, the author of "Œdipus," as the lawful heir of Corneille and Racine. He had come forward at a propitious moment. The mighty inspiration that had animated the age of Louis XIV. had long since departed. There were a few men of talent whose success was various in their different kinds, but there was no genius. The inexperienced Voltaire at his first appearance brought a new element upon the stage, philosophy, free thought, which gained his verses enthusiastic applause.

It has been said that Voltaire wrote the "Henriad" more from vanity than enthusiasm. It is possible, for this youth had a lofty ambition, and was indignant at the general prejudices that denied the French nation the possession of the epic character. The "Henriad," styled first the "Poem of the League," had an immense success at home and throughout Europe. France plumed herself on having found her poem; Voltaire was the Virgil, the Homer, of the eighteenth century.

Unhappily there was lacking to him the faith essential to

the production of an epic, faith in things ideal and invisible. Yet this grand drama of the League and St. Bartholomew is full of feeling and animation. Passages of incomparable beauty, portraits largely and boldly drawn, ingenious comparisons, graceful terms, happy verses, the fascinating eloquence of improvisation, torrents of thought overflowing with youth and vigor, make the "Henriad" one of the masterpieces of French literature, and one of Voltaire's most valid titles to fame.

The causes that assured the success of "Œdipus" contributed to the enthusiastic reception of the "Henriad." What was it at bottom but an eloquent pamphlet aimed at religious abuses? Despite the reticence and concessions of its language, no one is deceived. In the earliest period of the Voltairean philosophy nothing was strongly accented; irony was masked under an appearance of respect; the skepticism was uncertain, the thought playing on the surface of things; the attack was equivocal; indecisive, without precision of aim, entering upon religious ground only to strike at fanaticism and superstition. Beyond that the young poet prided himself upon his orthodoxy; he chanted dogmas, and defined them like a doctor of divinity.

The charm, the inspiration and life of the "Henriad," consist in an ardent, enthusiastic love for purely human and social virtues. The noble words, tolerance, liberty, independence, which now are commonplace and hackneyed expressions, then kindled men's imaginations. The age found in the poem the echo of its aspirations; free, independent thought was conducted by it from the narrow circle of a few philosophers into the broad popular domain.

In the year 1726, a victim for the third time of an odious exercise of arbitrary power, Voltaire went into exile, and with embittered feelings set sail for England, the land of liberty. A new world opened before him and enchanted him; England was to him the revelation of the genius of modern nations; the sight of a free country filled his heart with emotion.

No other traveler ever saw so many things and saw them so well. While he studied the principles of representative government and the machinery of liberty, he acquainted himself with the discoveries of science, industry, and commerce. A

daring speculator, he risked funds in distant enterprises, and laid the foundations of that immense fortune which was in after years to assure his independence and the security of his life.

Introduced by Lord Bolingbroke into the circle of the free-thinkers—of Pope, Swift, and Addison—Voltaire was soon intoxicated with the positive, materialistic philosophy of bold negations, then current in the upper classes of English society. During the three years of his exile he composed or prepared works that indicated a new and considerable development of his genius, "Brutus," "The Death of Cæsar," the "History of Charles XII," and the English Letters.

The "Philosophical Letters," written from England and scattered abroad in manuscript, were not published until after the brilliant success of "Zaire." Protected by the recent applause of all Europe, the author was respected; but the edition was seized, and the bookseller imprisoned in the Bastile. In these letters, under pretense of making France acquainted with England, Voltaire attacked all the religious and political institutions of his country. His lively and capricious pen dips into everything: theology, politics, geometry, the Church and literature, Bacon, Locke, Shakspeare, inoculation, the climate and soil, all are made to serve his purpose. The formidable talent to which he owes his power and popularity is brilliantly revealed in them, the talent for showing up the ridiculous and contemptible side of things. He does not decry a single abuse which we do not wish to crush under foot with him; we cannot doubt that he fights for justice and humanity; and yet we suffer from his attacks, for he disenchants everything he touches; he pays no regard to the natural instincts of the heart, he despises man.

"Brutus" was not successful as a stage piece. The French public was not prepared for those grand patriotic emotions with which Voltaire had become familiar in his acquaintance with England and the study of its theater. In this play he was inspired by Shakspeare, in so far, at least, as his peculiar genius could comprehend and appreciate the ideal beauties of the great poet.

In the "Death of Cæsar" the imitation is still more apparent. He seeks in it to awaken interest by strong and manly sentiments; he is large and simple.

"Zaire" is perhaps the only work of his in which any warm ray of poetry appears. For this once he did not imitate antiquity, but created a tragedy truly national. His withering philosophy hardly appears in it, and when it does, is so vailed by passion that we give it no thought. He is unsurpassed in the painting of the natural sentiments.

Voltaire was now the idol of the public; his name had become a power, his "Zaire" had conquered all hearts. A lady of lofty rank, the Marchioness Du Châtelet, became enamored of this fame, and received the loved poet to her pleasant country-seat of Cirey, on the borders of Lorraine and Champagne.

The connection of the philosophic reformer with the great lady, a devotee at once of pleasure and study, is in accordance with the manners of the time. Family ties were broken, the restraints of propriety boldly disregarded; virtue wanting, public opinion was no longer a check.

Cirey, Voltaire's retreat and asylum for twenty years, became the center of the philosophic world. From there the thought of the age radiated; travelers, men of the world, men of letters, all repaired thither; labor and festivity were united. Voltaire had his own tragedies played; he took the part of Orosmane; Emilie (Madame Du Châtelet) filled the role of Zaire. The poet spared no expense in decorating and beautifying his retreat. Cirey was a temple of taste and the fine arts, a Grand Seignior's caprice, a poetic magnificence. Alas! even Cirey did not confer repose or happiness. Weariness, disgust, the saddest passions, disturbed for fifteen years this unhallowed attachment.

But what a prodigious activity was Voltaire's! In the midst of festivals, pleasures, business, broils, often obliged to flee, his body weak and suffering, he worked incessantly. Dramas, light poems, comedies, histories, scientific researches, memoirs, satires, more than fifty works, followed each other in unbroken succession. This was the most brilliant period of his life; the philosopher had not yet destroyed the poet. "Alzire," "Mohammed," "Mérope," the "Prodigal Son," "Love," the "Essays on Man," and charming light poems, evince the strength and maturity of his genius.

The French language has nothing more flexible and natural

than some of Voltaire's epistles in verse and philosophical tales. Elsewhere ranking but second, he here excels. Delicate wit, a limpid and transparent style, and the soft hues of the imagination, are the charm of these light and vivacious productions, a charm so real that his admirers have said of him, "Voltaire is a philosopher waited upon by fairies."

Yet these fairy visitants inspire him with less grace than sportiveness and malice. Voltaire is all wit, but biting and caustic wit. There is nothing artless or good in him, as in La Fontaine; his heart is never affected; there are never in his writings any of those unexpected turns in which pleasantry hides a tear.

The real thought and life of Voltaire are seen in his immense correspondence, and verses improvised as passing events inspired, and sown broadcast over all lands; and indeed neither life nor thought is beautiful. He laughs, weeps, awakes emotion, assumes a variety of masks, does everything easily; but we seek in vain for some dominant principle, some moral power. No soul underlies this prodigious talent; only blind and capricious instincts rule the man.

Voltaire has now the measure of his strength; he sees clearly what he wishes to do, and selects the theater as the tribune from which to address Europe. In "Alzire" the dramatic emotions, the cast of the characters, the vigor of the action, have but a secondary importance. Its aim is to prove that the natural emotions are superior to those arising from religious convictions, and this philosophical thesis constantly peeps out to chill emotion and destroy the interest of the drama.

The true beauties of Voltaire's tragedies spring from the sensibility of his heart, and are born of the eloquence of the natural passions. The sacred titles of father and husband, the ties of blood and love, all the secondary powers of the soul, are for him lively sources of emotion and pathos. When Voltaire is natural he is exquisite; still he never evokes a religious impression. He seems to have understood Christianity no better when he attempted to extol it than when he decried it.

"Mohammed" appeared some years after "Alzire." It was the great dramatic success of the eighteenth century. It possesses much grandeur. Many of its characters are noble;

but the principal personage, Mohammed, throughout the play, wounds historic as well as moral truth.

Voltaire's aim in "Mohammed" was doubtless to make superstition detested, to inspire a horror of fanaticism, to unvail the ugliness of hypocrisy: but that was not all; he wished to show that fraud and imposture lie at the source of all religion.

The piece was applauded by the public; and with a stroke of audacity to be looked for only from him, Voltaire dedicated it to Pope Benedict XIV. The pope, for reply, sent his portrait and apostolic benediction. Nothing more clearly exposes the wretchedness of the time than this interchange of compliments between the declared adversary of the Gospel and him who should have been its chief defender. This conduct of the pope silenced cabals. Voltaire, furnished with a brevet of orthodoxy, could continue his work of demolition in peace.

The tragedy of "Mérope" was represented in 1742. For a moment Voltaire forgot his philosophical prejudices and produced a purely literary work. Never were his accents truer; never did he employ a severer form or a more correct style. The whole interest of the drama turns upon a single sentiment, the most powerful and profound in nature, maternal love. The piece is cold, and sometimes languishes; but is still the purest and most impersonal of his tragedies.

"Semiramis," "Orestes," and "Cataline" followed. The tragedies written after "Mérope" still contain brilliant scenes and successful parts; but Voltaire's dramatic vein was exhausted, no other masterpiece appeared. Yet the theater remained the great and constant passion of his life; it was in his eyes a social institution and a civilizing power.

To the prejudice of his fame, Voltaire wrote comedies, all of them of a hopeless mediocrity. Yet he owed to these mere nothings the only marks of favor he obtained from the Court. A ballet comedy, the "Princess of Navarre," and a poor opera, the "Temple of Glory," gained for him the titles of Gentleman of the Bed-chamber and Historiographer of France.

Soon after, the poem of "Fontenoy," an insipid adulation of Louis XV., opened the doors of the Academy, that had been closed to the author of the "Henriad" and "Mérope."

In the year 1736, while residing at Cirey, Voltaire received a letter with the signature "Frédéric P. R. de Prusse." He replied, and from that time a regular correspondence was carried on in prose and verse, in which prince and poet vied with each other in philosophic spirit, and exchanged their sentiments touching the welfare of nations and humanity.

When, several years after, Frederick succeded to the throne, and gathered about him all the illustrious men of the day, Voltaire allowed himself to be carried off by the "Solomon of the North," moved to it by the death of Madame du Châtelet, and by disgust at his false position in France, and the mean jealousies and ridiculous contempt of the court.

The court of Frederick was a strange one, almost entirely made up of soldiers and philosophers. Stranger still was the inner circle of the king's friends, composed of persons who had thrown off the yoke of popular prejudices, who laughed at the good God, at the *petits soupers* of the king, and gayly professed atheism. This dining-room society of blasphemers and cynics did not please Voltaire. He resembled these persons only in his worst points; his artistic temperament and love of the beautiful hindered his stooping so low. He could attack religion, but he did not like to have the bases of all social order unsettled. To escape from such follies he took refuge amid the glories of the grand century, the history of which he was preparing.

The "Siecle de Louis XIV." appeared at the time when, in return for his expatriation, he was deprived of his brevet of Historiographer of France.

Voltaire had before this attempted history. The "Histoire de Charles XII.," published in 1728, had given evidence of the wonderful flexibility of his talent. It lacks much, however, of being a masterpiece of history; it is rather a heroic adventure, rapidly recounted in a style admirably simple and nervous, and soberly and correctly elegant.

The "History of the Times of Louis XIV." is the most brilliant of panegyrics on that long and unfortunate reign, to whose share fell so much glory and so much misery. Never did an historian love his subject better, or bring out its great points into bolder relief. He transfigured the age. Like all the lengthier works of Voltaire, this is faulty in method

and plan; yet the grandeur of the impression is not diminished.

But a higher ambition had for a long time tempted this indefatigable mind. The "Essay upon the Customs of Nations" gives the application of the new doctrines to general history. The labor was immense. Voltaire worked at it from 1740 to 1756. Its erudition is indubitable, its acquaintance with authorities considerable for the time, its errors unavoidable in a work of such extent.

The essay is, more than anything else, a philosophical pleading, a pamphlet against man and religion. The matter of the book is sad, bitter, discouraging. Voltaire makes man too vile and wicked. He excludes Providence; he deprives history of its grandeur, by divesting the soul of its nobility, and humanity of its hope and ideal. His philosophy does not comprehend the progress of humanity any better than man himself. And yet, singular as it may appear, however small and contemptible he makes man, he sees nothing else. He does not perceive that above man's acts rule the acts of God, free, providential, and marvelous in their results.

In spite of these essential defects, Voltaire is the first historian of the eighteenth century. His claim rests upon the method he has introduced, and upon his having thrown light on many obscure points. His remaining historical works—the "Epitome of the Reign of Louis XV.," the "Annals of the Empire," etc.—do not rise above mediocrity.

While Voltaire was thus occupied, the little colony of philosophers about him was agitated by intrigue and cabals. The rest of his history at the Prussian court is only a burlesque Odyssey. The two great men, dissatisfied with each other, exchanged compliments and epigrams. Maupertuis, mad with pride, and jealous of Voltaire's fame, worked against him; the others rendered his situation unpleasant by their tattle; they all quarreled and wrote pamphlets, the king himself entering the lists. Wearied out at length, and dying with melancholy, Voltaire asked leave to go to drink of the waters at Plombières. He set out. At Frankfort an agent of Frederick arrested him, and reclaimed of him a work of the king's. Voltaire was conducted to prison with his niece, Madame Denis, and maltreated by subalterns. Released at last,

he pursued his journey, and finally arrived at Colmar, whence he filled Europe with his cries and indignation against Denys of Syracuse. Thus closes the ridiculous comedy.

Voltaire, fleeing from the court of Frederick, exiled from that of Versailles, wandered from place to place like a king without a kingdom, and shut himself up at the Abbey of Senones, to complete in solitude his great history of humanity.

At the age of sixty-one Voltaire had at last found a secure asylum on his estate of Ferney. There, on the borders of France, Savoy, and Switzerland, he made for himself a sovereignty that shed its light over all Europe. Lord of Ferney, Fournay, Monrion, and the Délices, he planted and cleared, litigated, established schools and a manufactory of clocks and watches, and built a church on which he inscribed, impertinently, "*Deo erexit Voltaire.*" This retired spot became, and remained for twenty years, the center of the social world: kings sent embassadors thither, princess came hither as visitors, learned men and philosophers as pilgrims, the oppressed sought here protection and refuge. Voltaire, at the height of fame and power, ruled public opinion, dictated decrees, kept his eye open to all things, and filled the civilized world with his name.

Hardly was he installed at Ferney when in his hours of leisure he created an entirely new sort of literature, the philosophic tale. He amused his contemporaries with these witty, charming, but altogether immoral relations, strange and whimsical in matter, though simple and pure in form.

Voltaire's "Satires," like these tales, are poisoned by a bitter and sarcastic gayety. He laughs where others would weep, even while discussing the great problem of sorrow and human destiny. This problem besets him. In "Zadig" he resolves it in the sense of optimism; but a superficial optimism not being able to stand before a real sorrow, he soon changes his opinion, and in his poem on the "Disaster at Lisbon," passes over, if not to pessimism, at least to doubt and sad despondency. The existence of evil troubles him, life seems worthless, and he takes refuge in an uncertain hope of a future and happier state of being.

But in "Candide," a masterpiece of cynical irony, a colossal piece of buffoonery, his last irresolution is dissipated, and the

terrible problem is resolved with a burst of laughter. We would like to consider "Candide" as a trifling witticism, aimed at an irreflecting optimism; but no! contempt for man is Voltaire's inmost feeling. He despises him and vilifies him. Yet love of humanity was his ruling passion; he boasted of it, and each of his works gives indications of it; his mission, for he had one, was to rescue man from barbarism!

It is difficult to find a chaste work among the many literary productions of the eighteenth century. Depravity was in the air; its friends and its enemies breathed it, and both were infected by it. It was reserved for Voltaire to surpass all others, and be in this, as in other respects, the most complete expression of his time. He wrote the poem that he had the audacity to entitle, "The Maid of Orleans." The manuscript pages were circulated from hand to hand; the poem was in all Europe when Voltaire decided to publish it. France did not resent its publication. Depravity of manners was accepted at the time as a social principle. Even the court itself, which had favored him little till then, yielded to his power. Madame de Pompadour, though now devout, was enchanted by the "Maid," and requested of the fortunate writer a translation of the Psalms in verse. It is asserted that she promised to obtain him a cardinal's hat. The project resulted in nothing; but the author of the "Maid," to please his new admirer, rendered into verse the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes.

From that time Voltaire, himself the highest arbiter of opinion, pursued with indescribable implacability the war he had declared against Christianity. His tireless pen was ready for anything: voluminous compilations, critical essays, history, diatribes, rapidly succeeded each other. He had cherished a plan of establishing a colony of philosophers at Clèves, the better to pursue the struggle against a religion, the fall of which he believed to be at hand. "I am tired," he said, "of hearing it repeated that a dozen men sufficed to establish Christianity, and desire to prove that but one is necessary to destroy it." His residence at the court of Prussia, where his dream was in a slight measure realized, had partly disenchanted him of it; but the spectacle of the profound decadence of the formal Christianity that then sheltered all tyran-

nies, and was closely connected with the most odious abuses, the sudden exasperation of religious fanaticism in the Calas and Sirven affairs, urged him to the last extremity. His passions overran all bounds; he attacked the very notion of all revealed religion, which he accused of being the principle of barbarism, cruelty, and human cowardice. To one who reproached him for leaving the soul void and hopeless, he replied, "I have delivered you from a ferocious beast that was devouring you, and you ask what I intend to put in its place? Nothing; religion is ended."

But Voltaire is not simply unbelieving, he is impious. His critical knowledge is superficial; his reasons are those of all the enemies of Christianity, from Celsus down—the impossibility and absurdity of miracles, the contradictory dogmas, the uncertainty and legendary nature of the divine history; nothing indeed that has not been said a hundred times. To supply his lack of knowledge he has recourse to ridicule and contempt, and speaks of man without modesty, of God without respect.

His contest with Christianity was wanting in all dignity. He employed the strategy of the Mohegan, but he did not think the truth worth the exposure of his life, or even of his quiet. We are pained to the verge of disgust when, in his voluminous correspondence, we follow this great man through the miserable subterfuges into which he is constantly led by care for his own tranquillity, and a desire to make a telling hit without suffering for his audacity. He hesitated at nothing, lies, calumnies, or perfidious accusations; and so entirely wanting in moral sentiment was he, that he was the first to laugh at his own unworthy acts.

Voltaire's power never lay in principles, and English deism became in his hands a doctrine that oscillated between skepticism and the vulgar requirements of common sense. He professed through life to believe in the eternal God, whom all nations adore under different names; but this God was a blind fatality, a celestial puppet, chained down by inexorable laws, and indifferent to the affairs of men.

His sentiments, we cannot call them doctrine, on the nature of the soul, are still less fixed than his theodicy. As Condorcet has observed, "He remained in an almost absolute

uncertainty as to the spirituality, and even the duration, of the soul after the body; but as he thought this last opinion useful, as well as that of the existence of a God, he rarely allowed himself to express his doubts, and always insisted more upon the proofs than upon the objections."

There was, perhaps, but one thing in which he firmly believed—civilization, society. It was for society he had need of God and the immortality of the soul; for society he required fear and hope; only for society's sake did he wish a morality. He never considered man in himself; as such he entirely mistook and lowered him; so his morality, rightly appreciated, is but a social guaranty. Virtue to him is that which assures the existence of society; it is confounded with benevolence and equity, and all the sentiments that bind men together: vice is that which separates and isolates, that which is prejudicial to the existence or happiness of the human race.

It would be extremely unjust to attribute to his vices alone the immense influence Voltaire exercised upon his age. All the oppressed stretched their suppliant hands to him. He was the first of his time to raise his voice in favor of the weak, the first to combat religious and civil tyranny, the first who stirred up Europe against persecutors. Though all things were not equally praiseworthy in the generous role he took toward the middle of his life, he nevertheless nourished a hatred of injustice and a passion for humanity.

Yes, passion is the true word, especially as evinced in the affairs of Calas, of Sirven, of Lally, and the poor Chevalier de Labarre. While Voltaire triumphed, and humanity with him, all power and legitimate authority cowered under the general contempt. It was the beginning of the Revolution.

Voltaire gave the death-blow to feudal society, annihilated privileges, struck down abuses, founded equality by leveling; but he did nothing for law, nothing for liberty. In his victories over religious intolerance, he sundered chains without creating a right. He founded tolerance on contempt for all religions, and denial of the claims of any.

We must pass rapidly over the last labors and years of Voltaire's life. The innumerable writings dating from this period announce the decay of his powers. Tragedy, to which he was

ever faithful, was transformed by the chilling influences of age to a philosophic machine without poetry or life.

Sadness fell upon Voltaire's spirit; he could not endure to grow old. Strangers ceased to congregate at the little court of Ferney. The thought of death, that thrust itself upon him at times, was attended only by doubt and uncertainty. No one has mentioned his sadness, so well did this laugher conceal it from all eyes. Yet it was real, and broke out here and there in his demi-confidences: "I have one thing more to say, my hero," he wrote to the Duke Richelieu, "in my general confession, and that is, my gayety has always been forced."

It was, perhaps, in one of those stops of the mental clockwork, or states of mental exhaustion so frequent as the end approaches, perhaps to escape annoyance and persecution in his last hours, that he became reconciled for a moment to the Catholic Church, and afforded the world the spectacle of that scandalous communion which sullies his memory as being a final outrage or an act of cowardice. Restored to health and hope, he was ashamed of himself; and to disguise the nature of the feeling that had urged him to an act so contrary to his real sentiments, he committed the further indignity of representing the act to his friends as a fearful parody on the mysteries of religion.

No one believed him; philosophers shrugged their shoulders and regarded him with pitying looks; religious men and the devout were scandalized by the miserable profanation, that besides was not the only one nor the last. What a pitiable state of things! What a subversion of all the social proprieties! Nothing keeps its place; nameless follies are the prelude to the bloody drama of the Revolution. Everybody hurries on and calls for the end. Voltaire himself prophesies, and cries, "We near the promised land, but I shall not see it. . . . Enjoy, my friends, the spectacle I have been preparing for you these sixty years, but at which I cannot be present with you. I am dying out; but I can say in expiring, like the old Lusignan, 'My God, for sixty years I've fought thine honor to maintain.'"

Before he died he wished to see Paris, from which he had been absent thirty years, and judge for himself of his power,

and the state of public opinion. He left Ferney, arrived sick, having but a breath of life left, and was received in Paris as no conqueror had ever been.

The enthusiasm was universal and profound. The streets by which he was to pass were densely thronged, the windows were filled with spectators. The crowd followed his chariot with shouts: "Long live the saviour of Calas!" "Long live the author of 'Zaire!'" "Long live the 'Maid!'" The Academy went forth to meet him, and received him as its king. At the theater, where "Irene," his last tragedy, was being played, the audience, on his arrival, rose as one man, and cheered and stamped for joy. Then an actor came and laid a crown of laurels on his head, and a thousand voices cried, "All honor to the universal man!" At the end of the play the curtain for an instant lowered, rose again, and all the actors covered his statue with palms and garlands. As he went out people threw themselves at his feet, and kissed his garments; the delirium was universal. Alas! beyond this triumph death awaited him; death full of trouble and anguish such as he had dreaded. He was not suffered to die unmolested. Priests surrounded him in his last agony, and extorted from him a last confession, in which are the words, "If God disposes of me, I die in the holy Catholic religion in which I was born, hoping that the divine mercy will deign to pardon all my faults; and if I have cast scandal upon the Church, I ask pardon of it and God."

The expiring life flickered once more, and the sick man recanted. "My poor child," he would keep saying to his niece, "they will throw my body into the sewer." He is said to have withstood the priest, who, in those terrible moments, entered upon a controversy with him and required a more explicit declaration. "Do you believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ?" cried the Abbé Gauthier, arousing him from his lethargy. "For God's sake, sir," answered Voltaire, "say no more of that man, and let me die in peace."

Although some of these details are more or less contested, it is certain that this wonderful intelligence was extinguished in unspeakable convulsions.

He who could boast of being the thought and life of his age, with difficulty obtained a tomb. He was inhumed in

haste, and almost clandestinely, in the church of the monastery of Scillières. The Academy was forbidden to pronounce his eulogy, and the theaters were prohibited from playing his pieces.

---

## Art. VI.—FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON.

*Life and Letters of Frederick W. Robertson, M. A.*, Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847–53. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke, M. A., late Chaplain to the Embassy at Berlin. In two volumes. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1865.

Some men owe their chief distinction to the circumstances with which they happen to be connected. Others owe little to externals, and interest us mainly by the history of their interior life, by what they thought and felt, the development of their moral and intellectual power. There is no doubt that every truly superior mind has an inward history, which, if it could be distinctly portrayed, would prove worthy of attention and study. These volumes are pre-eminently a mental history, which chains our attention by laying bare the growth, conflicts, and thinkings of a gifted and impassioned soul. It is frequently said that the organized associations which occupy every department of human activity, and other features of this age, are unfavorable to the development of individuality of character. The most laudable efforts of the solitary artisan are eclipsed and superseded by the result of the combined skill and industry of different countries and generations. The single-handed valor of the bravest of the brave no longer turns the tide of battle. Whatever field of investigation we select, we discover the footprints of previous explorers, till learning has become mainly a knowledge of what others have thought and done, rather than reading new pages from the book of nature for ourselves. Yet, at intervals, as if to give evidence of undiminished vigor, nature gives to the world a man of character so sharply outlined, and so unmistakably independent, that the admiration of those who are borne along by his influence, and the opposition of those who are alarmed at his disregard for canonized prejudices, alike point him out

as a leader among men, one who has sufficient innate strength of soul to swim against the prevailing tides and currents of the time. Such a man stands out before us in this biography.

Whatever differences of opinion may exist respecting the soundness of his theological teaching, there can be no question that Frederick W. Robertson possessed mental gifts which lifted him out of the ranks of ordinary men. Such intensity of feeling and vivid imagination has seldom been found in union with such clearness of intellect and power of sustained thought on abstruse subjects. In him are blended the mental subtlety of the philosopher, the spiritual vision of the poet, and the stern decision of the earnest practical worker. Though during his life his name was quite unknown on this side of the Atlantic, and comparatively so in England, yet no sermons of our day have awakened so deep and extensive an interest as the fragmentary discourses of this Brighton curate, whose life was so sorely lacerated with the thorns and briers of the wilderness, and who died with an oppressive feeling of failure and disappointment, shrouding like a dark shadow his worn and bleeding heart. They have stirred the hearts of thousands, both in England and America, with their burning and electric eloquence, and have probably been preached by many who have scarcely grasped their theological standpoint, or apprehended their logical tendencies. This extensive popularity of the sermons was naturally followed by a wish to know something of the author. To gratify this wish the present "Life and Letters" are given to the public. Like most recent biographies, the work consists mainly of selections from private correspondence. It is generally conceded that from no other source can we gain so true a conception of the character of a man. This method, however, may be overdone. Either from modesty or slothfulness, modern biographers frequently keep too much in the background. If the writer of a life be really qualified for the task he undertakes, by a special acquaintance with the subject of his work, he is surely under obligations to give the advantage of his superior knowledge to his readers, and, by a judicious condensation, to save them the labor of wading through piles of prosy correspondence for the sake of a very little additional knowledge.

These remarks do not apply to the work before us. Mr. Robertson has been fortunate in his biographer. The letters, though fragmentary and unconnected, help us to understand a man who is certainly worth knowing. The light they reflect upon the inner life and theologic opinions of their gifted author, constitutes the main value of this biography. They possess a rare freshness and attraction, and give us clear glimpses into his soul's life. Every sentence throbs with life and feeling; and bears an unmistakable impress of sincerity, earnestness, and independence. The portions of the work supplied by the pen of Mr. Brooke, though little more than the frame in which these fragments are set, evince superior mental grasp and culture, and a deep and appreciative admiration of Robertson's character and teaching. External events are properly only regarded in their influence on the development of his character. And although doubtless Mr. Brooke's warm admiration of the teaching and character of Robertson has led him to see everything in the most favorable light, we thankfully acknowledge the fearless candor with which he gives us letters that some would think reveal too much weakness and petulance to be published. We want to see such a man for ourselves. And we have in these volumes, taken in connection with his published sermons, the means of forming a tolerably correct estimate of the man, and of his position as a theologian.

The popularity of his sermons, and the manner in which his views are spoken of by many who claim an adherence to the standard theology of the Reformation, as well as the fact of his being in some sense a representative man, illustrating a tendency to freer thought and greater latitude of opinion in theology, warrant us calling the attention of the readers of this journal to a brief review of his mental history, as here indicated, and of the relation of his theology to the Bible, and to those central truths which constitute the creed of evangelical Protestants.

Frederick W. Robertson was born in 1816. He was the son of a British officer, who still survives him. He owed much to the careful education and watchfulness of his parents. Even in childhood, there seems to have been nothing in external nature that did not give him pleasure and awaken a vivid interest.

He excelled in manly games and athletic exercises, and yet joined to this a love of reading and quiet remarkable for one of his age. His progress in his studies early evinced superior mental capacity. Enthusiastic admiration of a military life was early developed, and continued singularly strong to the end of his life. "I was rocked and cradled," he writes, "to the roar of artillery, and the very name of such things sounds to me like home. A review, suggesting the conception of a real battle, impresses me to tears. I cannot see a regiment maneuver, nor artillery in motion, without a choking sensation." Application was made in his behalf to the authorities, and his name placed on the list, as a candidate for a place in a cavalry regiment in India. He began to study for this prospective sphere with ardent enthusiasm. It was long before the desired appointment was conferred, and in the mean time his friends began to urge him to enter the ministry. This caused him many mental struggles and deep perplexity. But at length, after the military appointment was obtained, mainly in deference to the wishes of his father, he decided for the ministry, and went to Oxford to study for orders. Here he was brought into direct contact with the Tractarian controversy; and, though rejecting the teaching of the High-Church leaders of that movement, he cherished a warm admiration for many of the men of that party, which was strengthened rather than diminished by the lapse of years. His Oxford life was chiefly distinguished by its exemplary character, and by his deep sense of the responsibilities of the sacred office, to which he looked forward. He was ordained in 1840, and was successively curate of Winchester and Cheltenham, which latter place he left in 1846, through causes that changed his whole future life.

During these early years of his ministry, although observant minds recognized evidences of superiority, he had not yet developed that remarkable intellectual power which arrested such general attention afterward at Brighton. The ascetic severity with which he observed the duties of religion during this period, reminds us of the struggles of John Wesley before he clearly apprehended the doctrine of justification by faith. The issue, however, was widely different. Mr. Robertson had entered the ministry, a decided adherent of the Evangelical

Calvinistic party in the National Church, and for some years maintained the tenets of that section.

The following quotations from his correspondence show his theological position during this period:

I believe there is at this time a determined attack made by Satan and his instruments to subvert that cardinal doctrine of our best hopes, justification by faith alone; and how far he has already succeeded let many a college in Oxford testify. It is the doctrine which, more than any other, we find our own hearts continually turning aside from and surrendering. Anything but Christ—the Virgin, the Church, the Sacraments, a new set of resolutions—any or all of these will the heart embrace as a means to holiness or acceptance, rather than God's way.

Again, speaking of a conversation with a professed Liberal at Geneva, he says:

My chief point was, to prove the death of Christ not merely a demonstration of God's willingness to pardon, on repentance and obedience, but an actual substitution of suffering; and that salvation is a thing *finished* for those who believe, not a commencement of a state in which salvation may be gained; insisting especially on Hebrews x, 14. . . . I admit that want of assurance is the mark of very low attainments in grace.

And at a still later date he writes:

I quite agree with you about the Calvinistic doctrines. I think we ought to preach them in the proportion in which they are found in Scripture, connected always with election unto holiness.

But these positions were very soon to be abandoned forever. As we pursue his history, we find him explicitly renouncing these views, and taking up a position of stern antagonism to the "Evangelicals," which at times was distinguished by an intense bitterness and aversion, that must be regretted as a weakness, partly resulting from his sensitive nervous organization.

During the later years of his stay at Cheltenham he began seriously to doubt the soundness of the views he had hitherto entertained. These doubts gradually grew upon him, until his soul was steeped in perplexity, and the creed of his youth seemed to drift from his grasp, like a wreck swept before the relentless waves of fate.

In the latter part of 1846, on account of the failure of his health, he went again to the continent, where he remained

for some months, preaching occasionally at Heidelberg, and deeply pondering the questions which now perplexed his soul with an agony of bewildering thought. Writing to a friend he says:

> For instance, suppose a man puts the question, *Who* was Christ? What are miracles? What do you mean by inspiration? Is the resurrection a fact or a myth? What saves a man, his own character, or that of another? Is the next life individual consciousness, or continuation of the consciousness of the universe? To these and twenty other questions which I could put, Krause would return one answer, Neander another, and Dr. Chalmers another.

The wildness and grandeur of the scenery by which he was surrounded, and the opportunity for solitary musing, afforded by relief from active duty and separation from friends, doubtless intensified the emotions which his inquiries awakened. Never, perhaps, were the struggles and doubts of a soul drifting away from the once sacred way-marks of life more vividly described than in a lecture afterward delivered in Brighton, in which he evidently portrays his own experience. Such words could only come from a soul that had felt the bewildering agony of doubt which they so vividly portray:

> It is an awful moment when the soul begins to find that the props on which it has blindly rested so long are, many of them, rotten, and begins to suspect them all; when he begins to feel the nothingness of many of the traditionary opinions, which have been received with implicit confidence, and in that horrible insecurity begins also to doubt whether there be anything to believe at all. It is an awful hour, let him who has passed through it say how awful, when this life has lost its meaning, and seems shriveled into a span; when the grave appears to be the end of all, human goodness nothing but a name, and the sky above this universe a dead expanse, black with the void from which God himself has disappeared! In that fearful loneliness of spirit, when those who should have been his friends and counselors only frown upon his misgivings, and profanely bid him stifle doubts which, for aught he knows, may arise from the fountain of truth itself; to extinguish, as a glare from hell, that which for aught he knows may be light from heaven; and everything seems wrapped in hideous uncertainty; I know but one way in which a man may come forth from his agony scatheless; it is by holding fast to those things that are certain still, the grand, simple landmarks of morality. In the darkest hour through which a human soul can pass, whatever else is doubtful, this at least is certain. If there be no God and no future state, yet even then it is better to be generous than

selfish, better to be chaste than licentious, better to be true than false, better to be brave than to be a coward.

During his stay at Heidelberg he plunged deeply into German metaphysics and theology, and he returned to Cheltenham less improved in health than his friends had hoped, though calmer and more composed in mind. The work of rejecting tenets he had held on the authority of others, without feeling their truth in his own consciousness, was now tolerably complete. The positive truths which distinguish his later teaching were, doubtless, more slowly evolved. Believing that "it has been given us to know our base from our noble hours; to distinguish between the voice which is from above, and that which speaks from below, out of the abyss of our animal and selfish nature," like a strong swimmer, who has confidence in his strength, he cast himself boldly into the tide of life, and parted forever from the position he once occupied. The honored term "Protestant," that had been the watchword of the Church in many a grave crisis, henceforth he strangely regards as designating only the Calvinistic Evangelism, which excited his strongest aversion. And hence he often charges "Protestantism" with views that the great majority of Protestants would indignantly repudiate.

Of the existence of a consistent system of theology, based on juster views of human freedom and responsibility, and nobler conceptions of the breadth and fullness of divine benevolence revealed in Christ, and held by a large section of the Protestant Church, he seems to have known nothing.

As we follow him from this great turning point in his mental history, we are sometimes saddened at seeing him so impulsively and fiercely assume positions that we cannot but regard as untenable and unsafe, yet he continues to the last distinguished by high-souled manliness, profound human sympathy, and unswerving fidelity to his convictions of truth.

Before returning from the continent he surrendered the curacy of Christ's Church, Cheltenham, which he had held for nearly five years. After remaining for a few months without a pastoral charge, he was appointed by the Bishop of Oxford to the curacy of St. Ebbs, Oxford. Here the eloquence and independence of his preaching was beginning to attract attention, when, with the consent of the bishop, he

accepted the perpetual curacy of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, which continued to be the scene of his labors till his death in 1853.

The year previous to his coming to Brighton was, as we have seen, the transition period in his theological views, and as he came with a fixed purpose to speak out his sentiments fearlessly, he soon awakened profound attention; like all earnest and independent preachers, securing both opposition and admiration. Many, who had previously gone to no place of worship, were charmed by the freshness and vigor of his sermons, and thronged his church. Thoughtful and inquiring minds, for whom he had cast light upon some of the perplexing problems of theology, or at least put a construction upon them that made them less objectionable, hung upon his words with deep and admiring interest. His friends claim for him that he was the means of bringing many Unitarians, and even Romanists, into the Church. But there is certainly ground to doubt whether this result was not attained rather by going a long way to meet them, than by bringing them to receive the historic doctrines of the Church of England.

He displayed a deep interest in the social and mental improvement of the working classes; organizing an institute and library for their benefit, delivering lectures on social and literary topics, and courageously opposing the introduction of infidel books into the library. He was so much the soul of this movement that the institute did not survive him. Though education and natural tastes prompted him to side with the aristocracy, his liberal principles and broad human sympathies led him always to identify himself with the people, and to defend the rights and dignity of manhood. This sympathy was so deep in tone, and warm in expression, that in some quarters he was charged with being in league with the Socialists and Chartists, whose errors he so fearlessly and wisely combated.

During the whole period of these Brighton labors, which encircle his name with such brilliant renown, though no longer the subject of such severe mental conflicts as those that harasssed his soul at Cheltenham, yet his life was overshadowed by a morbid melancholy. He felt himself to be isolated, by his independence, from sympathy, opposed and

misunderstood by former friends; a pioneer in intricate and thorny paths, without human guidance or companionship; and haunted continually by the silent but unyielding footsteps of a fatal disease. While his words were voices of hope and consolation to others, he bore about with him an intensely-lonely and sorrowful heart. This feeling that he was alone, misunderstood, and wronged by false judgment, inspired and developed that profound sympathy with the life and character of Him who "was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," and that ardent appreciation of Christ's human sympathy, that is so prominent a feature in many of his sermons. It is impossible to read such sermons as that on the "Loneliness of Christ" without feeling that the pencil with which he paints so vividly has been dipped in the crimson current of his own heart. And yet this feeling was more the result of constitutional sensitiveness and melancholy, increased by intense mental application and painful disease, than of any uncommon trials he had to endure at Brighton. That he was misunderstood and misrepresented, is doubtless true enough. It would have been strange had it been otherwise. What independent seeker after truth ever escapes this? Some, sincerely believing his teaching to be erroneous and dangerous, left the church. This pained and grieved him exceedingly. It is to be regretted that the opposition, or unfriendly criticism, which he affected to despise, should provoke such expressions of bitterness and hostility as occasionally escape him. He could not reasonably expect that people would listen quietly and approvingly to statements of doctrine which they regarded as at variance with their most cherished convictions of truth. If it cost himself such mental agony to tear himself loose from the faith of his youth, how could he suppose that others would renounce theirs without a struggle? He was certainly sufficiently ardent and outspoken in the expression of his own opinions, to have made greater allowance for the earnestness and frankness of those who differed from him. His biographer, in his intense opposition to the "Evangelicals," seems to give undue prominence to those expressions of aversion and complaint that a momentary weakness and pain may have wrung from his morbidly sensitive nature. Mr.

Brooke constantly takes for granted that Robertson was right, and all who differed from him, or opposed him, wrong; and that he was wronged and ill-used by all who did not accept his utterances as oracular. This is the intolerance of liberalism. He ought to have remembered Robertson's own words: "It seems to me a pitiful thing for any man to be true and to speak truth, and then complain in astonishment that truth has not crowns to give him, but thorns." It is astonishing what forbearance some expect. It is not enough that they are left to form their opinions independently, and to express them freely without restriction. To speak against them or oppose them is stigmatized as bigotry and intolerance. Such exemption from all unfavorable criticism, of opinions which we may regard as false or dangerous in their tendency, is inconsistent with any real attachment to our own views, or any belief of their truth and importance. Those who are drifting about in a cloud-land of skeptical uncertainty, without any fixed religious convictions, may treat all religious principles alike. But such a course is the result of indifference, not liberality.

There is something intensely sad in watching the progress of an unrelenting disease gaining its terrible conquests over the vital energy of the physical structure. But in Mr. Robertson's case this sadness is greatly increased by the nature of his malady, (disease of the brain,) which shattered his noble intellect, as well as prostrated his bodily health. He continued to work with an intensity that quickened his decline. Most of the time he suffered excruciating pain. He complains to his friends that he no longer had the capacity of thought he once consciously possessed. The refusal of the rector, on some personal grounds, to sanction the appointment of an assistant who was acceptable to Mr. Robertson and the people, gave him much anxiety and regret; and by leaving him to struggle alone with responsibilities for which he was utterly incompetent, hastened his end. Amid increasing pain and feebleness we catch occasional gleams of the old intellectual fire. But the struggle rapidly hastened to its close. On Sunday, August 15, 1853, at the age of 37, in the prime of manhood, he died. "At his own chapel that morning, when the rumor went round that there was no hope, and

God was to be sought to hear the prayer for him and all sick persons, many wept bitterly; but the greater part of those who loved and venerated him were stunned beyond the power of weeping."

In following the course of Robertson's outward history we discover no peerless distinction that separates him from his contemporaries. Many, whom oblivion enshrouds in her impenetrable shades, have passed through similar struggles, successes, and sorrows. It is the light cast back upon his life by the blaze of fame and popularity kindled by the publication of his sermons, a few years after his death, that invests the incidents of his life and mental growth with such uncommon interest. He indicates his right to be enrolled with the gifted sons of genius, by the fact that at the point where common names grow dim and pass away from sight forever, his only begins to gather around it a deeper interest, and to shine with clearer and more enduring light. In the history of the British pulpit no similar productions (left by their author without a thought of publication) have secured equal attention. What is the secret of this influence? To all thoughtful minds his deep though subdued earnestness, his singular felicity of illustration, his glowing imagination, flashing light on the obscure and giving life and form to the abstract, his clear, musical voice, "which seldom rose, but when it did, yielded a rich volume of sound, toned like a great bell," and the force and beauty of his thoughts, must have made him, in the best sense of the terms, popular and attractive as a preacher. But all this would not fully account for the interest of his sermons as read. The printed sermons of many distinguished preachers unvail no power to account for their popularity. Those who ascribe the charm of these fragmentary remains simply to beauty of style and the congeniality of their doctrinal teaching to the unrenewed heart, evince an incapacity to comprehend Robertson, or grasp the secret of his intellectual power. No one cause will account for this popularity, which is the result of several distinct elements of interest combined.

He grappled manfully with some of the perplexing problems of theology which disturb the minds of men; hence, to those who had felt these difficulties, his attempted solutions,

whether satisfactory or not, would possess a special attraction. This is evinced by the numbers who have felt the charm of his words, though widely differing from his doctrinal opinions. Much also is due to the fact that his inquiries led him in the direction in which a portion of the theological thought of Britain and America was already drifting. He had a rare capacity of sympathy with the most diverse feelings. It is a great point gained when we feel that a preacher or writer understands our doubts, and can fully enter into our perplexities. His natural courage brought out in bold relief his independence as a thinker. He dared to utter whatever he believed to be true. He hurled stern words of rebuke against every form of oppression, and spoke tender words of sympathy with humanity in every condition of sorrow. His denunciations of all wrong-doing were fierce and blistering, something in which men of different creeds could unite and sympathize. But, above all these, is the glowing earnestness of his soul. His thoughts are on fire. His mind is a volcano, throwing out in liquid streams the mental ore that has been dissolved by its intense heat. Not the beauty of his style, though his language is often eminently felicitous and expressive; not the grandeur of his thoughts, though frequently truly sublime; not the keenness of his intellectual glance, which often, like sheet-lightning in the darkness, unvails a hidden world of thought; not the logical force of his arguments, in this they are often deficient; but, above every other source of attractive interest, we are disposed to place the fact that they are the utterances of one who has himself felt deeply, and struggled anxiously to solve the perplexing problems of being and truth. Every thought has been molten in the furnace of his own heart before it was coined into those burning words that quicken the pulses of the blood, and convey to the heart of the reader something of the emotional warmth in which they originated. He possessed that indefinable thing which we call genius; whose potency we feel, but cannot describe. In the suggestive fragments he has left behind him it may be truly said,

> "Bright-eyed Fancy, hovering o'er,
> Scatters from her pictured urn
> Thoughts that breathe and words that burn."

We come now to a question of far higher import than the cause of Robertson's popularity, namely, wherein did he differ from the acknowledged tenets held by all evangelical Protestants? And is he on these points sound and true, in harmony with the word of God? No matter how brilliant his genius, or how beautiful his speculations, if his doctrinal teaching is not founded upon truth it is unworthy of confidence, and only the more dangerous from its attractiveness. And no matter whether he is accounted orthodox or heterodox, as compared with sectarian and human standards, if his teaching is true it will live in spite of all opposition.

Robertson himself gives us a key to much of his teaching, when he represents himself as seeking to discover "the soul of good in things evil," seeking to find deep and important truths hidden under the form of familiar and acknowledged errors. This is strikingly displayed in his treatment of the Romish errors, for which he had generally some word of apology to offer. He saw in Mariolatry an attempt to realize the idea of a pure and perfect womanhood, by those who had not recognized that in Christ the highest virtues of the race, male and female, are embodied and illustrated; in the doctrine of purgatory, the expression of a hope that pain in the future world may be "remedial and not penal," at least "to those who are neither heavenly nor damnable;" in the apostolical succession he saw "not the power of God conveyed by physical contact, not a line of priests, but a succession of prophets, a broken and scattered one, but a real one." He thought "that ultra-Protestantism missed the truth contained in transubstantiation," namely, "that the sacrifice of Christ is repeated daily in the hearts of all faithful people, forever going on, but not in the sacrifice of the mass;" whatever that may mean. In absolution he discovers "the forgiveness of man as man, carrying with it an absolving power," "that the minister absolves as the representative of humanity," as "a type and assurance of divine forgiveness."

Now it is doubtless the duty of all candid seekers after truth to practice to some extent this method. We should not give an unconditioned condemnation of a person, without examining all modifying circumstances that may lessen his culpability; nor of an opinion, without inquiring what degree

of truth may exist in union with the error it contains. But, when such search becomes the habit of the mind it has grave disadvantages. It tends to make us think lightly of error. There is no heresy but may contain some latent truth. But the danger is, that minds on the alert to discover whatever truth any wrong opinion contains, will forget the virulence of the falsehood in their satisfaction at discovering some element of truth. An error may be grave and fatal, and yet contain some portion of truth. What is false may be active, while the truth is latent, and even unapprehended. The truth found in union with falsehood is often nothing more than the beverage in which the poison of error is dissolved. There is also a dangerous tendency in such minds to soften the evil of error by certain fanciful discoveries of truth and goodness that will not bear close scrutiny. This defect is unmistakably illustrated in many of the expositions of doctrine given by Mr. Robertson.

But it is not only to acknowledged errors that this method is applied. The tenets of Protestantism, as popularly understood, are all to him errors, from which he eliminates the truths they contain. Under this treatment the name of a doctrine may be retained, but it no longer represents the same truth, and is not used in its historic sense. Prayer, regeneration, the vicarious atonement of Christ, the inspiration of the Scriptures, etc., may be spoken of with due frequency; but they must be very easily satisfied who take it for granted that these terms are used by him to represent the same ideas which they represent in the historic theology of the Church. We will briefly glance at his views on two or three points, which will illustrate this assertion.

The doctrine of baptismal regeneration he firmly rejected. But he regards it as based upon the important truth that all men are by nature the children of God, and that baptism authoritatively declares and specially reveals this fact. Hence he confesses that, practically, there is little difference between himself and the Tractarians on this point. If his statements merely related to infants, they would be less exceptionable. But he has no idea of any such limitation. He distinctly rejects "that view which maintains that you are not God's child until evidence of a regenerate life is given, until signs

of a converted soul are shown;" and boldly declares that human "nature became, viewed in Christ, a holy thing and divine;" that "the appearance of the Son of God is the sanctification of the human race." Is it possible that any one who knows and reveres the teaching of Divine truth can admit that a sinner, dead in trespasses and sins, is a child of God in any other sense than by creation? How can such an assumption be reconciled with St. Paul's statement, that Christians "were by nature the children of wrath, even as others?" Or with that of St. John: "as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God?" Not the sinner in his sin, but "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Nor is there any warrant for the assumption that baptism is the only authorized revelation of our relation to God. How could it be such a revelation to an unconscious infant? Is not our relation to God, and privileges through Christ, revealed in the word of God? Such fanciful theology may be acceptable to those who reject the inspiration of the Bible, but "we have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto we do well that we take heed."

He regards the expectation that God will answer prayer by any direct interposition of his power, as contrary to the uniformity of the laws of nature, the facts of experience, and the character of God; and injurious in its influence on those who cherish it. In this view he assumes that mind and matter are governed by the same law; and that the power and freedom of God are limited by the forces of his material creation. Mr. Robertson is not the only theologian of our day who, while repudiating Pantheism, assumes positions that are essentially pantheistic.

He does not think that there is any authority, either in the Old or New Testament, for the Christian observance of the Sabbath; but that it rests solely on the necessity and advantages of observing the day as a day of rest, worship, and recreation. He avows his acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity, but the deity of Christ is somewhat superfluous in his system of doctrine. He assigns no work to Christ as our Redeemer that requires or implies his godhead.

Though he had an intense hatred of wrong-doing, and admiration of goodness, yet he never seems to have grasped

any adequate conception of the holiness and dignity of the divine law, and of the sinfulness of corrupt nature, preventing our access to God, and requiring an atonement to vindicate the dignity and stability of the law, and the holiness and mercy of the Lawgiver. He rejects that theory of the atonement which represents Christ as suffering the penalty of sin and the wrath of God, and human guilt as being canceled in the ledger of heaven by his righteousness. But he does not indicate any acquaintance with that view of the atonement which regards the sufferings of Christ as an equivalent for the penalty, the result not the cause of divine mercy, whereby the outgoings of divine mercy are harmonized with the claims of divine justice, and the power of infinite love is unvailed, to subdue the sinful heart to penitence and obedience. He speaks of the vicarious sufferings of Christ, and of his reconciling man to God, but he gives no reason for the necessity of his suffering. In answer to the question, "If God is love why do we need a mediator?" he replies, "I think the best answer is, I do not know." Now Mr. Robertson is daring enough in speculation when it suits him; and the mediation of Christ is a great central truth, which must have some discernible fitness, arising out of the character of God and the moral condition of men. And if so great a fact appears as a superfluity in his system of theology, it may justly create a doubt, that his conception of man's relations to God are not in harmony with truth. His conception of the results of the atonement are equally hazy and unsatisfactory. He indeed represents Christ as reconciling man to God, man to man, man to himself, and man to duty. But all this is accomplished by the influence of his holiness and self-denial operating upon our minds, and leading us to imitate his example. In Christ's dying for all, he finds no higher meaning than that "he was the victim of the sin of all," and that "his sacrifice represents the sacrifice of all." That is, that he suffered from his contact with the universal wickedness of men, and his suffering is the type of what we must suffer! He says "the value of the death of Christ consisted in the surrender of his self-will. . . . the profound idea therefore contained in the death of Christ is the duty of self-surrender. . . . He [God] saw humanity subject to the law of self-sacrifice,

in the light of that idea He beholds us as perfect, and is satisfied." Thus the great scriptural truth that Christ died for our sins, and that we have redemption through his blood, is dissolved into airy mist, and supplanted by fanciful and baseless speculation.

Mr. Robertson also rejects the doctrine of a direct revelation from God, of special truths, to the minds of the writers of the Holy Scriptures. He says in one of his letters, "The difference between Moses and Anaxagoras, the Epistles and the 'Excursion,' I believe is in degree. The Light or the Word which dwells in all men, dwells in loftier degree in some than in others. . . . I think this view of the matter is important, because in the other way some twenty or thirty men in the world's history have had a special communication, miraculous, and from God. In this all have it, and, by devout and earnest cultivation of the mind and heart, may have it increased illimitably." In his sermon on "The Good Shepherd" he says, "There is a something in our souls of God, which corresponds with what is of God outside us, and recognizes it by direct intuition; something in the true soul that corresponds with truth, and knows it to be truth." This view of Inspiration cuts away at a stroke "the promises of God," and deprives the Bible of any just claim to be called "the word of God." "If any man," says Paul, "thinks himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."

We do not believe that we are left without any means of knowing truth from error, and right from wrong. But we believe in using all the faculties with which we are endowed, reason as well as intuition. We confess that some theologians have not duly recognized these capacities of the soul with which God has endowed us. But to assume that "nothing is more evident than truth," that the soul intuitively recognizes it, and needs no evidence from the reason, and no authority of an objective revelation, is to contradict the whole moral history of our race, and to overlook the spiritual condition of men, as portrayed in the Holy Scriptures and confirmed by history and observation. To speak as if the natural feelings and impulses of men are a safe law of life, is to forget that dark and evil passions have seized the helm of the soul, and

are steering it on toward destruction. It is misleading and fallacious to speak of the feelings of men enslaved by passion, prejudice, and ignorance, as if they were the intuitions of a pure and elevated humanity. If men were perfectly holy, their convictions respecting truth would be widely different. But of what practical value is this conclusion, as long as the supposition on which it rests is not true? If our belief in any ordinary fact depends upon the authority of the testimony on which it is given, why may not our belief in the great doctrinal facts of the Gospel rest upon the authority of the testimony by which they are sustained? These theories may be true of the inhabitants of some other sphere, but they do not fit here; on the contrary, the authoritative revelation of his will, which God has given to be an objective law of life, is eminently adapted to the condition of beings liable to error, and "having the understanding darkened through the ignorance that is in them."

We cannot pursue this subject further. What has been said may suffice to show the direction of Mr. Robertson's theological progress. There are doubtless many modifying considerations to be taken into account in judging of his theological position. It must be conceded that his sermons are not designed to form a system of theology, and were published without his consent or revision; that he sometimes expresses a familiar truth by language that gives it a new form; that his meaning is often obscure, and that he is not always consistent with himself; that he was, to use his own graphic figure, like a pilot steering a zigzag course through dangerous rocks, and not to be judged by those who merely watch the vessel's course from the shore, and see not the rocks which he sees. But after making every concession that truth and fairness demand, it is beyond doubt that there is a broad and radical difference between many of his doctrinal views and the teaching of those who are generally regarded as the standard expounders of Protestant theology.

Although an original and independent thinker, on some important points he is in substantial agreement with the Rationalists of the Anglican Church, as represented by the authors of "Essays and Reviews." He is however separated from them by his devout piety; and by being no mere icon-

oclast, breaking down without building up. He sought earnestly, and with great mental acuteness, to present positive views of the truth, which he believed to be more in harmony with the religious consciousness of the age. He was a Rationalist, with strong High-Church leanings, who never quite shook off the influence of his education among the despised "Evangelicals."

He always seems to assume that the teaching of the Anglican Church must be right, although he is compelled to put the most unnatural and fanciful construction on many of her tenets before he can adopt them as his own. He cherished an ardent admiration for the character and writings of Channing, which was not without some influence on his ardent and susceptible mind. And in nearly every instance in which he forsakes the old landmarks of the theology of the Reformation, he drifts in the direction of the more evangelical Unitarians.

Some may deem our exceptions to his theology inconsistent with our expressed admiration of his character. We would cast no shade of doubt on the sincerity of his piety and the nobleness of his life. His life reflects honor on humanity. But we are not of those who allow their admiration for his excellences to hush all doubt regarding the soundness of his teaching. Let us not confound things that should be kept distinct. Are we to admit the Unitarianism of Channing, the election and reprobation of Calvin, the miraculous gifts of Irving, or the wild dreams of Swedenborg, because we admit that they were gifted and sincere men? Like Schliermacher, Fichte, and others, the piety of Robertson's heart seems to have shielded him from the logical consequences of the speculations of his brain. But this does not prove that his errors are harmless. The errors which are maintained by a writer are often more injurious in their influence on others than to himself. This was singularly so in the case of those German writers just mentioned. The philosophy that led others into gross Pantheism seemed to have little practical influence upon themselves.

But the practical result of a general adoption of these principles to which we have taken exception, is scarcely doubtful. It may be that some who deny any scriptural authority for

the Sabbath, and place its claims merely on the visible need and advantages of a day of rest, will, from habits of piety, continue to observe the day reverently. But will not the general promulgation of the doctrine that there is no divine authority for the Sabbath, be adverse to its devout observance? Persons who have formed the habit of prayer may continue to observe this duty after they have ceased to believe in God as the answerer of prayer; but who will be induced to begin to pray, that has no expectation of God answering his prayers? He who believes that all men are by nature children of God, and that this relation is declared and ratified by divine authority in baptism, cannot feel that he needs to seek the regenerating grace of the Spirit, by which alone we can be born from above. It may be that some to whom the Bible has become precious, will continue to study and revere its teaching after they have adopted theories of inspiration which undermine its authority and rob it of its claims to our confidence; but what will be the effect of a general adoption of the belief, that it merely contains the thoughts and feelings of good men, and is in no proper sense "the word of God," or a revelation of his will as the law of life? Such a belief cannot be entertained without a total revolution in our views of the relation of the Bible to the development of spiritual life.

We have spoken of Robertson as one of the signs of the times in theology, one of the indications of a tendency to greater latitude of speculation, and a bolder and more relentless criticism; a tendency to give less weight to formal and rigid statements of doctrine, and a higher place to the convictions of the conscience. However it may be accounted for, this movement is sufficiently important to claim a candid, patient, and intelligent investigation. There must be something in the present condition of theological science which has prepared the way for it. And as almost every heresy is an exaggerated truth, that has not been duly recognized in the orthodox confessions of faith, there must be some element of truth in this movement to which it owes its strength. Is there nothing in dogmas based upon misconceptions of the figurative and poetic language of Scripture, in stereotyped platitudes and half-truths being taken for the whole truth, thus teaching for doctrines of revelation the commandments and opinions of

men, and in the want of a just recognition of the dignity of the individual conscience, from which this movement may be largely a reaction? One thing is certain: It cannot be put down merely by greater stringency in enforcing confessions of faith, or by dogmatic and intolerant denunciation. This would only strengthen it. Its errors must be calmly and fairly met by the force of truth. It will be well for the Church if she prove herself sufficiently liberal and discriminating to recognize whatever truth the movement may contain, and the lessons it teaches, while holding fast with unabated confidence those great Scripture verities which have inspired her noblest achievements, and nerved the strength of the great "cloud of witnesses" who "through faith and patience inherit the promises."

---

## Art. VII.—MILTON'S EARLY LIFE.

### GENIUS AND WORK.

It is a common error to make genius a sort of spontaneity, a perennial jet from Castalian fountains, rather than a Jacob's well produced by labor. Milton's life contradicts all such notions. Whatever other gifts he had, it is certain that of hard work took the lead. In his particular line he was the greatest applicant and hardest worked man in England. He studied himself blind at an early age. His whole history is a rebuke to those lazy dreamers who court genius in idleness. Work makes our great men, and idleness, in most cases, unmakes their children. Hence the rare propagation of distinguished qualities. A Webster and Clay seldom arise from the same families in two successive generations. After one such production, nature, as if exhausted by the endeavor, sinks back into the tamest mediocrity.

### BIRTHPLACE.

Milton had a very unpoetical birthplace. He first saw the light on Bread-street, in the heart of the London of 1608, (Dec. 9,) when that renowned city had less than 200,000 inhabitants, about as large as New York was thirty years ago, when

Canal-street was its northern boundary. His exquisite paintings of country life were perhaps an offshoot of its contrast to his own dusty and fetid home, of which contrast he was made feelingly sensible by occasional rural excursions. As much as this he hints at in the following beautiful passage:

> "As one who long in populous city pent,
> Where houses thick and sewers annoy the air,
> Forth issuing on a summer's morn to breathe
> Among the pleasant villages and farms
> Adjoined, from each thing met conceives delight,
> The smell of grain, or tedded grass, or kine,
> Or dairy, each rural sight, each rural sound;
> If chance, with nymph-like step, fair virgin pass,
> What pleasing seemed for her, now pleases more;
> She most, and in her look seems all delight."

This sort of pleasure, like most of our city denizens, Milton had a higher appreciation of from its being only occasional, and so sweetly different from his ordinary experiences. We of the city enjoy as much perhaps from a month of rural life as countrymen all the year round, and being more condensed it makes a stronger impression, and leaves behind it more salient points in the memory. No one expatiates so beautifully on the pleasures of early rising as Thomson, who was remarkable for his late hours in bed.

Bread-street, in spite of its unpoetical name, was at the time the resort of poets; for the Mermaid Tavern, where Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, and other literary celebrities held their convivial meetings, was located upon it, and not far from the house in which Milton was born. Shakspeare died when Milton was seven years old, and Jonson when he was twenty-eight; and how much acquaintance they may have had in his family, or whether any, we are not informed. If he shared at all in their inspirations, it was not from local contiguity, but from reading their works, which he early devoured, as also much of the extant English literature of that age. He was omnivorous in his reading appetite, as his works abundantly prove.

The first distinct relic of Milton's physique as a child is left us in the form of a portrait of him by a Dutch artist when he was ten years old. No one can gaze on this childish image without peculiar feelings. Its half moon frill around the neck, edged with lace and stiff with starch, its nicely fitting

jacket with bands, and its row of buttons down in front, and the general aspect, bespeak a child of genteel training and surroundings, one from a family of the *élite* in that age. The face is rather long for its width, the eyes large, clear, and expressive, and what is most remarkable of all, is the grave and serious mind which seems to be looking out upon one. Already great ideas had evidently begun to germinate in that childish mind. One in looking upon this young face feels the truth of what Milton says of himself:

> "When I was yet a child, no childish play
> To me was pleasing; all my mind was set
> Serious to learn and know, and thence to do,
> What might be public good; myself I thought
> Born to that end, born to promote all truth,
> All righteous things."

He seems to have come from his mother an anointed seer, and hence his early grasp upon all things above, beneath, around, and within, by which to instruct and elevate the coming ages. It may do to have one such child in a thousand years; but that the race would be benefited by having such the general type of childhood, we should be slow to believe. Lambs frisk and leap, and why should not children?

The events whose inspiration he had begun to feel at this early age were by no means insignificant. One of them was the first publication of our common version of the Bible, which took place when he was three years old, so that his earliest reading must have been in this version. And as much learned controversy on the merit of different versions followed its publication, it is to be presumed that the subject must have had place among his first reading recollections, and imparted to him the inspiration of which he speaks, as from

> "Siloa's brook that flowed
> Fast by the oracle of God."

On his fourth year died the eldest son of James I., thus introducing into the direct line of succession the unfortunate Charles, who lost his head; while in his fifth year Bartholomew Legate was burned at Smithfield for Arianism, an event which may be supposed to have had a strong influence upon a child's mind, and producing in him, perhaps, that repugnance which

he ever manifested to all persecution, or distraints upon liberty and conscience. On his seventh, Carr, Earl of Somerset, the court favorite, was tried for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, and was disgraced; while first Villiers, and afterward the celebrated Buckingham, became premier, involving great political changes. In his eighth year occurred the quarrel between the king and the Scotch Kirk, from an attempt to impose bishops on the latter, attended by most exciting debates, which seem to have inspired Milton with a peculiar abhorrence of prelatical power. Sir Walter Raleigh was executed when he was ten, as an act of concession to the Spanish Court; and the same year the Synod of Dort assembled to balance accounts between Calvinism and Arminianism. Milton no doubt gave his early and earnest thoughts to these religious divergencies, and has embodied his conclusion in various passages.

"Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell;
* * * * *
. . . nor can justly accuse
Their Maker, or their making, or their fate;
As if predestination overruled
Their will, disposed by absolute decree,
Or high foreknowledge; they themselves decreed
Their own revolt."
"God made thee perfect, not immutable;
And good he made thee, but to persevere
He left it in thy power; ordained thy will
By nature free, not overruled by fate
Inextricable, or strict necessity:
Our voluntary service he requires,
Not necessitated."

The intuitions of the poet relieved the Calvinic and Arminian controversy of its subtleties and intricacies, and set the subject before us in a light to command the convictions of all ages. God made men free, men made themselves wicked, is a conclusion to which Solomon came three thousand years ago: "God made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions."

### FITTING FOR COLLEGE.

From his tenth year onward Milton was in the full career of the immortality which labor and learning are able to impart. His father designing him for the Church, and being in

no great sympathy with King James and his bishops, put his son under the tuition of one Thomas Young, a bluff honest Scotchman, who had been driven from his country by the king's coercive measures. Thus the poet was nourished at the breasts of Dissent and Puritanism; nor to the day of his death did he prove untrue to his training. Young was a man of learning, and earned for himself the warmest eulogiums of his pupil, who speaks of "the incredible and singular gratitude which he owed him;" and adds, in a Latin poem full of classic allusions, "you are dear to me as Socrates to Alcibiades, Aristotle to Alexander, and as Phœnix and Chiron were to Achilles." Such allusions in our age would be deemed pedantic, but they accorded to the times of Milton. "I have explored," he says, "the recesses of the Muses, and beheld the sacred green spots of the cleft summit of Parnassus, and quaffed the Pierian cups, and, Clio favoring me, thrice sprinkled my youthful mouth with Castalian wine," which means, in our direct way of speaking, that under Young's tuition he had gone deep into Latin and Greek if not into Hebrew, and had begun to think, feel, and perhaps write as a poet.

How hard he worked at this early period may be seen from what he says of himself: "My father destined me while yet a little boy for the study of humane letters, which I seized with such eagerness, that from the twelfth year of my age I scarcely ever went from my lessons to bed before midnight; which, indeed, was the first cause of injury to my eyes, to whose natural weakness there were also added frequent headaches. All which not a little retarding my impetuosity in learning, he caused me to be daily instructed both at the grammar-school and under other masters at home; and then, when I had acquired various tongues, and also some not insignificant taste of the sweetness of philosophy, he sent me to Cambridge, one of our national universities." The ambition of the elder Milton, like that of too many other parents, must have got the better of his judgment, for instead of restraining the dangerous ardor of his son, he rather stimulated it, and gave orders to "the maid-servant to sit up for John" till he wished to retire. This was stimulating a free horse to his death, and the poor son run himself into blindness before half his race was accomplished.

The grammar-school of which Milton speaks in the foregoing extract was that of St. Paul's Churchyard, London, and was at the time taught by the Gills, father and son, men of critical learning and considerable celebrity as authors. By a bandying of epithets between this and St. Anthony's school the boys in the latter were called "St. Anthony's pigs," while Milton and his school-fellows were familiarly known as "St. Paul's pigeons," a species of nicknaming not infrequent among our Saxon ancestors. The younger Gill divided his devotion between his cups and his books, and was about equally celebrated for hard study and hard drinking. This is rather a rare combination of qualities. It is nevertheless true that the young man, though troublesome to his father and an annoyance to his friends, had yet much solid learning; and Milton for many years continued his correspondence with the Gills, and accorded them much consideration.

What his precise curriculum of studies was at St. Paul's we are not told; but from an address to his father we gather that it must have included not only Latin and Greek, but some attention to Hebrew and the languages of Continental Europe. Speaking to his father he says: "When at your expense I had obtained access to the eloquence of the tongue of Romulus, and to the delights of Latium, and the great words, becoming the mouth of Jove, uttered by the magniloquent Greeks, you then advised me to add the flowers which are the pride of Gaul, and the speech which the new Italian, attesting the barbarian inroads by his diction, pours forth from his degenerate mouth, and the mysteries which are spoken by the prophet of Palestine." His indefatigable nocturnal as well as daily studies, not only in school but under private tutors at home, made him, by the time he was fifteen years old, when he closed his academical course and entered college, a great proficient in various learning, and placed him far in advance of his fellow freshmen in the university. Indeed, he did not confine himself to books, but practiced music, for which he was an adept, and dipped into everything "to learn and know," as he says, "and thence to do what might be public good." Knowing, certainly, if not doing, was the passion of his life.

HIS CAMBRIDGE LIFE.

Milton was admitted to Christ's College 12th of February, 1624, when he found himself surrounded with rollicking students, many of whom spent more time in sport and revelries than at their books. They were accustomed to speak of the three taverns of the town as "the best tutors," and when one of these taverns, "The Miter," fell, a fellow composed the following ditty on its rebuilding, which was said and sung with infinite sport:

"Then drink sack, Sam, and cheer thy heart;
Be not dismay'd at all;
For we will drink it up again.
Though we do catch a fall.

"We'll be thy workmen day and night
In spite of bugbear proctors;
Before, we drunk as freshmen all,
But now we'll drink like doctors."

In this jolly life the students were not alone, but in their own circles the doctors and learned professors had their part. Smoking was almost universal, which seems the more remarkable, since the practice had been introduced into England only a few years previous by Sir Walter Raleigh, and so much disgust did it excite in court circles that even King James himself wrote a scathing book against it, and did what he could, by influence and authority, to put it down. The narcotic pipe proved more than a match for kingly power, and smoking made such rapid progress that in a single generation it had become universal, especially among men of leisure and studious habits. The Indian weed, with all its disgusting properties, has an occult influence on the human nerves which it is difficult to explain.

Drinking and smoking among the students were attended by other irregularities, which made discipline difficult and in some cases impossible. Instead of keeping themselves to the prescribed academic costume, they put on all manner of fantastic dresses, "new-fashioned gowns of any color whatsoever, blue or green, or red or mixed, without any uniformity except in hanging-sleeves; and their other garments light and gay, some with boots and spurs, others with stockings of diverse colors reversed one upon another, and round rusty caps."

Priests and undergraduates "had fair roses upon the shoe, long frizzled hair upon the head, broad-spread bands upon the shoulders, and long merchants' ruffs about the neck, with fair feminine cuffs at the wrist." All these fantasies were mere matters of fun and frolic. Some added the grave dereliction of "nicknaming and scoffing at religion," and asserting "debauched and atheistical principles." They absented themselves from prayers, converted fast-days into occasions for feasting and drunkenness, and sacrificed more to Venus than to Minerva. This was a remarkable state of things at a seat of learning containing such men as Milton, Jeremy Taylor, and some of the most renowned Puritan scholars and divines.

The authorities expressly decreed that "no woman, of whatever age or condition, dare, either by herself, or, being sent for, be permitted by others in any college, to make any one's bed in private chambers; or to go to the hall, or kitchen, or buttery; to carry any one's commons, bread or beer, to any scholar's chamber, within the limits of the college, unless she were sent for to nurse some infirm sick person;" "that young maids should not be permitted, upon any pretext whatsoever, to go to students' chambers." The rogues were like uneasy swine, constantly contriving how they might break these inclosures of authority, subjecting king and Parliament to new devices "to bring home that long-banished pilgrim discipline," to use the words of the king himself, who seemed more solicitous about keeping the conduct of others right than his own. But in the midst of these disciplinary measures, news reaches college that the king is dead, and that his son Charles has succeeded to the throne. And a few weeks later, the well-dissembled mourning was changed to conviviality by tidings that Charles had by proxy married Mary, a French princess, meeting her as his wife first at Dover, kisses her and inspects her feet, to see that her shoes did not make her seem taller than she really was: whereupon some college wag wrote,

> "All places in this castle envy this,
> Where Charles and Mary shared a royal kiss."

The bride was described as "nimble and quick, black-eyed, brown-haired, in a word, a brave lady."

In the midst of all these scenes Milton though little over fifteen years of age, was more than ever buried in his books, and "it was usual for him to sit in his study till midnight," and by "his indefatigable efforts he profited exceedingly." Genius, wit, and labor all concurred in his case to bring to pass those results which have made him a prodigy of talent and attainment to all ages. Two causes were working around him, however, to which at the time he paid little attention, to undermine the throne of the Stuarts and bring on the revolution: one was cavalier voluptuousness and oppression, and the other Puritan austerity and love of liberty. Cromwell's tutor was then at Cambridge, and Milton himself afterward became his secretary. Our student was too much absorbed in his books to prognosticate these events, conversing more with the ancient dead than with living actors, and enjoying the "sweetness of philosophy" more than the pleasures around him or the anticipations of power.

In the absence of railroads, telegraphs, and daily newspapers, Joseph Meade, one of the senior fellows and a genial man, was *newser* for the college, keeping a record of events transmitted to him from various sources, in which among other singularities is the following from London market: "A cod-fish in whose maw, when it was opened in the fish-market, there was found a book in decimo-sexto of the bigger size, together with two pieces of sailcloth. The book on being dried was found to contain three religious treatises bound together," one of which was entitled a "Mirror or glass to know thyself;" by John Frith, the same who was associated with Tyndale in the translation of the Bible, and who suffered martyrdom under Henry VIII. in 1533. The book was written in the Tower, at London, a year previous to and as a sort of preparation for his own anticipated martyrdom. That a fish should bring from the deep sea such a message for England, was well calculated to make "the graver sort" feel that it was a voice from God, and "the three treatises were printed in London the following year, under the title of 'Vox Piscis,' 'The Voice of the Fish.'"

Lord Bacon died in 1625, when Milton was eighteen years of age, and we cannot wonder at his interest in philosophy with access to the works of such a writer, though it was a

branch of learning then in a transition state, the Aristotelian philosophy being still in vogue, but suffering many inroads from the inductive method. Newton was not yet born, and the mathematics at Cambridge had not acquired the pre-eminence they reached in later ages. Still Milton had a true idea of the Copernican system, and hence he sung,

> "What if the sun
> Be center to the world; and other stars,
> By his attractive virtue and their own
> Incited, dance about him various rounds?
> Their wand'ring course, now high, now low, then hid,
> Progressive, retrograde, or standing still,
> In six thou seest; and what if seventh to these
> The planet earth, so steadfast though she seem,
> Insensibly three different motions move?"

One thing is certain, Milton's learning, however advanced, or from whatever source derived, was touched with Promethean fire, took on all beautiful forms of thought, and became both the nurse and the offspring of his genius. The metrical current of his prolific mind had already begun to flow, and his friends were apprehensive that his health and life might give way under the enormous pressure of his studies and his aspirations. One of them wrote him in Greek to check his ardor, and said to him among other things, "Why do you despise the gifts of nature? why do you persist inexcusably in tying yourself night and day to your books? Live, laugh, enjoy your youth and the present hour. In all things else your inferior, I both think myself and am superior to you in this—that I know a moderation in my labors."

Milton answered in Latin while he was enjoying a vacation at his father's in London, assuring his friend that he was having "the most agreeable relaxation." "When I am wearied," he adds, "the pomp of the winding theater takes me hence;" and he describes the acting of some of Shakspeare's plays, and comes to the grave conclusion that British ladies were superior to those of ancient Greece, or Rome, or Troy, or Egypt, or Persia, a very natural prejudice of all lads and lasses, we believe, in favor of their own countrymen and women. He adds in conclusion, "It is fixed that I go back to the rushy marshes of Cam, and once more approach the mur-

mur of the hoarse-murmuring school." In another part of this letter he says, "At present it is no part of my care to revisit the reedy Cam; nor does the love of my forbidden rooms yet cause me grief. Nor do naked fields please me, where soft shades are not to be had." These passages indicate dislike to Cambridge and its scenery, which has led some to suppose that Milton was not popular there, and that it was only after urgency that he was induced to return. But the truth is, after staying seven years in the place, he had a pressing invitation from his college to remain still longer, and the highest encomiums were pronounced on his scholarship.

During this vacation in 1626, six years after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, he wrote the following on the death of an infant:

"O fairest flower, no sooner blown than blasted!
Soft silken primrose fading timelessly;
Summer's chief honor, if thou hadst outlasted
Bleak winter's force that made thy blossom dry;
For he being amorous on that lovely dye
That did thy cheek envermeil, thought to kiss,
But killed, alas! and then bewailed his fatal bliss."

Milton received his first degree in 1628, when he was twenty, and his second in 1632, when he was in his twenty-fourth year. Between these periods he had written several pieces of poetry, and had a pretty sharp contest with a reverend prelate who charged him with inconsistency for knowing so much about theaters and yet professing to be a puritan. It seems that this charge grew out of the ridicule which Milton had bestowed on certain theatricals in which the reverend gentleman had been concerned in college. Milton caustically replied: "Your divines have been seen upon the stage writhing and unbowing their clergy limbs to all the antic and dishonest gestures of buffoons and bawds, prostituting the shame of that ministry they had or were nigh having, to the eyes of courtiers and court-ladies with their gowns and mademoiselles. There, while they acted and overacted, among other young scholars, I was a spectator; they thought themselves gallant men, but I thought them fools; they made sport, and I laughed; they mispronounced, and I misliked; and to make up the Atticism, they were out, and I hissed."

These theatricals appear, some of them, to have been enacted in honor of a visit from the king and queen, Charles and Mary, whose unpopularity was already beginning to appear. Among the regulations for the reception, it was decreed by the college authorities "that no tobacco be taken in the hall nor anywhere else publicly," which further shows the prevalence of the weed at that time, and that it had not yet become agreeable to the Stuart dynasty. Milton seems to have behaved himself respectfully to their majesties, though he was by no means a favorer of their despotisms either in State or Church. He subscribed to the Creed so far as to get his diplomas, but was no doubt deterred from entering the ministry under the spiritual tyranny exercised by Laud, and from a disgust at the whole order of Church ideas and usages. He hated prelacy as much as he loved liberty and republicanism.

### RETIRES TO HIS FATHER'S COUNTRY RESIDENCE.

At the time of his leaving Cambridge his father had left London, and become a resident of the little country village of Horton, about seventeen miles west of London, where he remained five years engaged in the further prosecution of his studies, and writing some of his earlier poetry.

A short time previous to this his likeness was taken. "In stature," he says of himself, "I confess I am not tall, but still what is nearer to middle height than to little; and what if I were little, of which stature have often been very great men both in peace and war, though why should that be called little which is great enough for virtue?" His contemporaries say of him that he was a little under the middle height, had light brown hair, his complexion exceedingly fair, his face oval, and his eyes a dark gray. The white and red were so delicately blended in his face that he was called "the lady" in college, this feminine appearance being increased by "the light brown hair falling to his ruff on both sides of his oval face, and his slender and elegant rather than massive form." "His deportment was affable, his gait erect and manly, bespeaking courage and undauntedness." He had a sonorous voice, delicate and tunable, and pitched rather for tenor than bass in singing. He gave himself to manly exercises, especially fencing, in which he was an adept, though in purity of character

he was even more virgin-like than in his personal appearance. Seriousness was the pervading tone of his mind; and he himself says, "in festivities and jests I acknowledge my faculty to be very slight."

Milton may have been modest, but his modesty had in it a vast amount of self-asserting power. He was fully conscious of his own abilities, or of their superiority to the ordinary run of mankind, and hence the assurance with which he spoke, years before Paradise Lost was written, of his "doing something that his country would not be willing to let die." His was the self-assurance of a conscious unflinching virtue. It goes along with that "moral austerity of character which has been alleged to be discernible in him even in his youth, rather than with that temperament of various sensibility which is, according to the general theory, regarded as characteristic of the poet." Milton was as far as possible from all such variations. His self-esteem was not of a kind to need the praises of others to sustain it. It did not succumb to the illimitable obloquy of his closing career, when the Cromwell Commonwealth was dead, the Puritans were in disgrace, the cause with which he was identified had failed, and he was a poor blind old man hiding himself in the byways of London from the myrmidons of power, and eking out a neglected life by means of the small pittance secured by school-keeping. Under these adverse circumstances it was that he achieved the great purpose of his life—Paradise Lost. Like John Wesley, he was too self-asserting to be happy in domestic life, and hence his separation from his wife, and the state of subordination in which he kept his daughters. He was too strong in himself and in his great mission to lean upon others, or make others happy in leaning upon him. As a controversialist he was as keen in satire as he was overwhelming in argument.

These thoughts go beyond the design of our present paper, however, as we are concerned only with his youth, in which we find the abundant seeding of what he became in his old age. His five years at Horton were devoted to communing with books and with nature. His profession was that of literature. Here he wrote his L'Allegro, his Il Penseroso, his Comus, and other large pieces, which have secured a permanent place in English literature. The first was given to sport

and laughter, the second to melancholy; the Comus was acted in his neighborhood in a masque, and the lesser pieces were addressed to the nightingale, or written in reference to various subjects in which he had a passing interest.

His first published piece was a little epitaph on Shakspeare, which was inserted in earlier editions of that renowned poet.

> "Thy easy numbers flow; and that each heart
> Hath, from the leaves of thy unvalued book,
> Those Delphic lines with deep impression took,
> Then thou, our fancy of itself bereaving,
> Dost make us marble with too much conceiving;
> And, so sepulchred, in such pomp dost lie,
> That kings, for such a tomb, would wish to die."

His aspirations toward the invisible and eternal he thus sets forth in one of his early pieces:

> "Such where the deep transported mind may soar
> Above the wheeling poles, and at heaven's door
> Look in, and see each blissful deity,
> How he before the thunderous throne doth lie,
> Listening to what unshorn Apollo sings
> To touch the golden wires."

In this frame of mind it was, especially as assisted by the revelations of God's word, that he came to feel that beings in heaven and beings in hell were great realities, and that their mighty deeds were passing before him and calling for a record from his historic pen. At twenty-three we find him writing thus thoughtfully of himself:

> "How soon hath Time, the subtle thief of youth,
> Stol'n on his wing my three and twentieth year!
> My hasting days fly on with full career,
> But my late spring no bud or blossom show'th,
> Perhaps my semblance might deceive the truth
> That I to manhood am arrived so near;
> And inward ripeness doth much less appear,
> That some more timely happy spirits endu'th.
> Yet be it less or more, or soon or slow,
> It shall be still in strictest measure even
> To that same lot, however mean or high,
> Toward which Time leads me, and the will of Heaven;
> All is, if I have grace to use it so,
> As ever in my great Taskmaster's eye."

By leave from his father and a due supply of money, (Milton had yet earned nothing in life to subsist upon,) he set out with

one servant on his continental journey. This was in 1638, when he was thirty years old. He spent some time in Paris, which he did not like, and then moved on by slow stages to Marseilles, and arriving at Florence, he remained two months enjoying the beautiful climate and scenery of Italy, and holding converse with Galileo and other celebrities. To this great man, whom the pope imprisoned for his invention of the telescope, he thus alludes:

> "The broad circumference
> Hung on his shoulders, like the moon, whose orb
> Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views,
> At evening from the top of Fesola,
> Or in Valdarno, to descry new lands,
> Rivers or mountains in her spotty globe."

Milton no doubt had a peep at the moon through Galileo's telescope, and describes what he saw. The umbrageous surroundings of Florence no doubt supplies the following allusion:

> "On the beach
> On that inflamed sea he stood, and called
> His legions, angel forms, who lay entranced,
> Thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks
> In Vallombrosa, where the Etrurian shades
> High-overarched embower."

In a letter written at Florence he thus alludes to his interest in the place and in Italian literature: "I certainly, who have not wet merely the tips of my lips with both these tongues, (Greek and Latin,) but have, as much as any, to the full allowance of my years, drained their deeper draughts, can yet sometimes willingly and eagerly go for a feast to that Dante of yours, and to Petrarch and a good few more; nor has the Attic Athens itself, with its pellucid Ilissus, nor that old Rome with its banks of the Tiber, been able so to hold me but that I love often to visit your Arno and these hills of Faesule." At Rome he also remained two months, and then he made his way home through Switzerland, having been absent thirteen months. And in conclusion he adds a testimony showing the strength of his character and the purity of his life: "I again take God to witness, that in all the places where so many things are considered lawful, I lived sound and untouched from all profligacy and vice, having this thought perpetually with me: though I may escape the eyes of men, I certainly could not the eyes of God."

On his return home he embarked in the controversies of the revolution, became Cromwell's secretary, and for twenty years he had little leisure for those quiet literary pursuits to which he had devoted his life. No country in the world owes so much to Milton's defense of the freedom of the press and the cause of liberty as America.

---

## ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### PROTESTANTISM.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

IMPORTANT PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY—THE RITUALISTIC CONTROVERSY—THE COLENSO CASE—APPOINTMENT OF SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS.—The Convocation of Canterbury had on the 26th of June a highly important discussion on the Romanizing innovations in the worship of the Church of England. It will be remembered that some time ago the subject was sent to the House of Bishops by a representation from the Lower House, suggesting the danger to be apprehended from an excess of ritualism, while on the other hand any change in the prayer book was deprecated. The bishops, in return, desired the Lower House to appoint a Committee of Inquiry. The request was complied with, and it was the report of this committee (Dr. Goodwin, Dean of Ely, being chairman) which called forth the discussion on the 26th of July. On the whole, the ritualists were satisfied with the report. The report gave a history of the ritualistic usages which the party tries to introduce, and deprecates any attempt at a judicial settlement of the question of ritualism, urging moderation on both sides. A zealous Low Churchman, Lord Arthur Hervey, regarded this report as entirely unsatisfactory, and moved, as an amendment, to take steps for determining authoritatively the legality or illegality of altar lights, incense, and wafer bread. High Churchmen and Broad Churchmen combined for defeating this amendment, the latter taking the ground that no party should be driven out of the Church, but that on the contrary the gates of the Church should be thrown open so widely as to allow all the Dissenters to enter. The High Churchmen, on the other hand, are anxious that no one adhering to High-Church principles be harmed, and one of their speakers significantly stated that perhaps the practices which had caused so much anxiety might be found to be a link to the unity with other Christian Churches, (the Greek and the Roman Catholic.) The result of this discussion was the rejection of the amendment, and the adoption of the report by a vote of 38 to 9.

The House of Bishops again debated on the Colenso case. The Archbishop of Canterbury announced that a letter had been received from the secretary of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church of America, stating that it had come to the knowledge of the bishops that the Convocation of Canterbury had passed a resolution approving of the firmness and devotion of Bishop Gray, the Metropolitan of South Africa, in his proceedings against Dr. Colenso. Some of the bishops (those of London and St. David's) did not know what "the American bishops were talking about," as they had not been present when the resolution, referred to in the American address, was passed. Great satisfaction was, however, expressed on all sides with the increasing intercourse between the two branches of the Anglican Church, and a committee of seven bishops was appointed to prepare an address to the American bishops. The Bishop of Oxford then proposed to answer the question submitted to the English bishops by the diocese of Natal. The Bishop of Oxford moved that the bishops answer that question to the effect that the Church of England did not hold communion with the Bishop of

Natal, and that it did hold communion with the orthodox bishops of South Africa. A majority of bishops, however, were opposed to committing themselves on the first part of this resolution, and by five against four votes adopted an amendment, declaring that they held communion with the Bishop of Capetown and those bishops who with him declared Dr. Colenso to be *ipso facto* excommunicated. The Lower House gave to this amendment a unanimous consent. In reply to the question from the Bishop of Capetown, "Whether the acceptance of a new bishop on our part, while Dr. Colenso still retains the letters patent of the Crown, will in any way separate us from the Mother Church," the Bishop of Oxford proposed the following declaration:

That as it has been decided on appeal to the highest judicial court in this kingdom, on the one hand, that the Church in the province of Natal, in communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, is in the eye of the law a mere voluntary association; and, on the other hand, as the letters patent do not profess to confer spiritual power, and have been declared by the court to convey no episcopal jurisdiction; it is the judgment of this House that the acceptance of a new bishop does not impair the connection or alter the relations existing between the members of the Church in the province of Natal and the Church of England, provided: 1. That the bishop be canonically consecrated according to the use of the Church of England. 2. That there be no invasion of the title of the Bishop of Natal conveyed by her Majesty's letters patent.

As regards the measures to be taken to secure the appointment of a new bishop, the bishop proposed that the House of Bishops should recommend:

1. That an instrument should be prepared declaratory of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa, which every priest and deacon appointed to any office should be required to subscribe. 2. That a godly and well-learned man should be chosen, with the consent of the communicants of the Church, to be the bishop. 3. That the person so selected should be presented for consecration either to the Archbishop of Canterbury or to the bishops of the Church in South Africa, as might be hereafter deemed most advisable.

The Bishops of London, St. Davids, and others, declared themselves opposed to the appointment of a second bishop: but after being submitted to some verbal alterations, the first resolution of the Bishop of Oxford was carried by 6 to 4. The second resolution was also agreed to. The Lower House assented to both resolutions.

In addition to the discussion on the ritualistic innovations and the case of Bishop Colenso, several other important subjects claimed the attention of the Convocation. For the first time the House of Bishops took decided steps for an increase of the number of bishops. The Bishop of Oxford presented the unanimous request of a committee appointed to consider "as to the best mode of providing assistance for bishops in the event of illness, or old age, or the like, rendering them unable to discharge the duties of their office, and needing some assistance in the performance of the same." The committee considered the appointment of coadjutor bishops, *cum successione*, would be unadvisable, being not suited to the Church of England. But, on the other hand, they considered it very desirable to bring into active operation the act of Henry VIII., which empowers the nomination of suffragan bishops to different posts in England, who might render every assistance that might be required. The committee were of opinion that in most cases the expense of those suffragan bishops could be met by their holding important posts, such as deaneries and canonries, in connection with the Church. Any legislation for the settlement by law of any expense upon those bishops to whom the assistance was rendered, was deemed inexpedient. The committee also recommended that an attempt should be made, through the Archbishop of Canterbury, to sweep away any difficulties which have existed in regard to the matter. As regards the appointment of suffragan bishops, the bishop is to nominate two, and the Crown to select one of these. On motion of the Bishop of Oxford, seconded by the Bishop of London, the report of the committee was adopted. The High Church organs, in England and America regard this as probably the most important thing yet done by Convocation since its revival.

## FRANCE.

THE RATIONALISTIC CONTROVERSY.—While there can be hardly a doubt that, on the whole, the evangelical school is in

the ascendancy in the Reformed State Church of France, the Rationalists continue to have full sway in the South, and they seem to grow bolder the more clearly it appears that they are in a minority. They made a bold manifestation at a conference held at Nimes in June, and attended by twenty-nine members, pastors and elders. The subject proposed for discussion in this assembly was expressed in the following words: "What is the testimony of the New Testament relative to the *historical reality* of the *resurrection of Jesus Christ*, and what is the *importance of this fact* to the religious life of the Church?" M. Grotz, one of the pastors of Nimes, had been appointed to make a report on the subject of this question. He took the ground: 1. That the resurrection of Christ was not at all proved by the evidence of the Gospels and the Epistles. 2. That it is a mere historical problem, which may be solved in two opposite ways. 3. That the early Christians accepted as a corporeal or material resurrection what was but a mere vision, a fancied or imaginary resurrection. 4. That this fact is insignificant after all, and in no way concerns the foundations of the faith, or the conditions of salvation. Of the members of the conference twenty-six, more or less, explicitly adhered to the views of M. Grotz, and only three protested against them. It is generally believed in the French Reformed Church, that occurrences like the conference at Nimes will hasten the moment of a full and final separation of the two parties.

A clear proof of the relative strength of the two parties in the Reformed Church of France, was recently given by the election of a new Professor of Church History of the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Montauban. This election is made by the whole of the consistories of the Church. It appears that the candidate of the evangelical (orthodox) party, Bonifas, who is near relative of Guizot, received the vote of 87 consistories; while the two candidates of the liberal party, Goy and Vignié, received together only 35 votes, (Goy 33 and Vignié 2.) Counting the votes, of the ministers and elders forming the consistories, Bonifas received 894, Goy 454, and Vignié 91 votes. This clearly shows that the evangelical Church is largely in the ascendancy in the consistories.

## SCANDINAVIA.

INTERCOMMUNION BETWEEN THE SCANDINAVIAN AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES.—The High Church party of the Anglican Churches, both in England and the United States, have long been desirous to promote intercommunion with the Scandinavian, and in particular the Swedish Church. These efforts have, at length, met with a response. In July 1866, the Archbishop of Upsala, the head of the Swedish Church, together with three bishops, took an active part in the dedication of an Anglican chapel in Stockholm, which was performed by the Bishop of Illinois, assisted by four English clergymen. After the creed had been read in English, the Archbishop rose, and repeated the same translated into Swedish. The Nicene Creed was repeated at the same time in both languages by all persons present, each in his own tongue, the archbishop leading in Swedish. After a sermon from the Bishop of Illinois, Archbishop Reuberdahle assumed his full episcopal vestments, came before the altar, and delivered to the congregation a short address in Swedish. Kneeling before the altar he offered up a prayer, and pronounced the final benediction over the congregation. The High-Church party in the Anglican Church regard this act as a formal renewal of an actual communion between the two Churches.

As another important step in the same direction, the same party regards an invitation extended to the Bishop of Illinois, to take part, together with a Scottish bishop, in the consecration of a bishop for Iceland. They consider this as the expression of a desire on the part of the Icelanders to receive the apostolic succession by an undoubted title from "the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic." They perceive significant foreshadowings of the same spirit in Denmark, and hope that from these it may be communicated to Lutheran Germany.

*Foreign Mission Societies.*—It is only a few years that any of the Scandinavian countries has had its own foreign mission, but at present they are making great efforts to make up for past delinquencies, and to emulate the societies of other Protestant countries. Denmark has a flourishing missionary society, which has now a mission of their

own in their old mission-field, South India. Their missionary at Bethany or Putabaukam sustains an orphanage, with forty children, and his congregation consists of several native and adult Christians. The last autumn the missionary college at Copenhagen sent out the first two of its pupils to India. They are not yet ordained, but are to finish their missionary education in India. A third missionary will now be sent out and act as a lay brother, taking charge of the temporal concerns of the station. The receipts of the Danish Missionary Society for the last year amounted to about four thousand dollars.

A second missionary society of Denmark, the "Dano-Greek Missionary Society," owes its origin to certain peculiar views of the founder, the Rev. Mr. J. V. Block. Mr. Block, one of the ablest ministers of the theological school of Grundvig, four years ago formed a plan of a united Scandinavian and Greek mission among the Mohammedans. Following the allegorical interpretation of the Rev. Mr. Grundvig of the seven letters in the Apocalypse, that the seven congregations represent seven great national congregations, believing that the sixth congregation is the Scandinavian national congregation, and the seventh a congregation that is to be formed from among Mohammedans, he felt himself called to go out as missionary to the Turks, and wished to undertake this mission jointly with the Greek Church. The Danish Missionary Society, to which he first addressed himself, refused to employ him, partly on account of his peculiar views, and partly because the mission to East India required all its resources. When Prince George of Denmark was elected king of Greece, Mr. Block established a Dano-Greek missionary society. Recently he has secured the support of the Moslem Missionary Society, which will co-operate with the Dano-Greek Missionary Society, sending him as missionary among the Turks.

The missionary society of the Swedish Church has established its first mission among the Galla tribes of Africa. The first three missionaries left for this field a few months ago. This is the first Protestant mission among the Gallas, a tribe who call themselves Christians, but they are Christians of the Abyssinian stamp.

## ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

### RUSSIA.

THE UNITED GREEKS IN POLAND.—The Russian government continues to make the most strenuous efforts to separate the remainder of the United Greek Church from the Church of Rome, and to reunite it with the State Church of Russia. In Russia Proper its endeavors have been almost fully successful. In the kingdom of Poland the United Greek Church still numbers about 222,000 souls (in 1840, 235,966) who belong to the diocese of Kholm. Nearly all of them (213,564) live in the government (province) of Lublin, which has at present an aggregate population of 1,008,359 souls; of whom, according to Russian geographers, 403,687 are of Polish and 457,098 of Russian (Ruthenian) nationality. This country was formerly part of a Russian principality, and in the fourteenth century, together with other Russian possessions, united with Poland. The Poles made a vigorous propaganda in behalf both of their nationality and of the Catholic Church, and with considerable success. At present the Poles constitute about one half of the population. Of the Russians one half have been fully incorporated with the Latin Church, while the other half belong to the United Greek Church, which also recognizes the supremacy of the pope, and only differs from the Latin Church in a few usages, which the pope has allowed them to retain. The orthodox (non-united) Greek Church has in the government of Lublin only a population of 6,642 souls. The Russians charge the Polish nobility with a design to undermine the existence of the United Greek Church, in order to amalgamate the population more thoroughly with the Poles. At an inspection of the United Greek Churches in 1863, it is stated that of the total number of 381 churches, 201 were in ruins. Of educational institutions only one seminary at Kholm was left. The Russian government had both a political and religious interest in gaining the confidence of the United Greek population, in order to recover them as much as possible both for the Greek Church and for the Russian nationality. In July, 1864, the patronage of Roman Catholics over United Greek parishes was prohibited, and to the latter the right of self-government accorded. At the same time

the government allotted the sum of 50,000 rubles for repairing their churches. In November, 1864, the government suppressed four United Greek convents which served as a center for Polish and Roman Catholic propaganda. Only a single convent of the communion was allowed to exist at Warsaw. The property of the suppressed convents was devoted to the improvement of the condition of the parochial clergy and of the churches. Subsequently the government forbade also the society of the "Felicians," whose aim was the fusion of the United Greeks with the Roman Catholics. Several primary schools were established for the United Greeks, and in 1865 a "gymnasium" (college) was established at Kholm, and a "progymnasium" (lower classes of a college) at Biala, in both of which the whole of the instruction is given in the Russian language. In June, 1866, all the parishes were divided into twelve ecclesiastical districts, and their superior administration concentrated in the hands of the government commission for interior and ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom of Poland. The parishes are divided, according to their importance, into three classes, each of which has a fixed salary, besides a lot. The bishop receives an annual salary of 5,000 rubles, the consistory 2,000 rubles, the seminary of Kholm 12,450 rubles, another ecclesiastical institution 3,600 rubles. Altogether the government allows for the support of the United Greek Church the sum of 169,055 rubles.

## ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

THE Epistle of Barnabas is calling forth quite a number of learned treatises in Germany. Of this epistle, which has twenty-one chapters, the first four and a half chapters were, until 1859, only known in a Latin translation. In that year Professor Tischendorf discovered the whole of the Greek original in a convent of Mount Sinai. He published it in his edition of the Codex Sinaiticus, (*Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum*, second edition, Leipzic, 1863.) The first five chapters are also given in the second edition of Dressel's "Apostolic Fathers," (*Patrum Apost. Opera*, Leipz., 1863.) A separate edition of the whole Greek text, with the ancient Latin version, a critical commentary, and notes, was published last year by Professor Hilgenfeld of Jena. (*Barnabæ Epistola*, Leipzic, 1865.) A new and very able treatise on the epistle has just been published by Dr. Kayser, (Roman Cath.,) professor at Paderborn. (*Ueber den sogenannten Barnabas—Brief*, Paderborn, 1866.) Professor Hefele, one of the most competent judges on the literature of ancient Church history, gives the following summary of the results of this book: 1. The integrity of the epistle cannot be denied. The attempt of Schenkel to distinguish between a briefer primitive form and an amplified revision is a total failure. 2. As regards the authorship of the epistle, Dr. Kayser adduces strong arguments that the epistle was not written by the apostolic father, Barnabas, but that it is of later origin, and was probably written at the beginning of the second century. 3. Dr. Kayser finds that the epistle was probably written at Alexandria, by a Christian of the allegorizing school, and that it was probably ascribed to apostolic Barnabas because the Ebionites, who are specially opposed in this epistle, seem to have frequently referred to Barnabas as favoring their opinions. 4. Dr. Kayser tries to establish that the readers to whom the epistle was addressed were not Jewish Christians, but Gentile Christians. Dr. Hefele, who in his former monograph on the epistle (1840) had advanced the opposite opinion, admits that Dr. Kayser has fully proved his assertion.

A new work on Pelagianism has been published by Dr. Wörter, (Roman Cath.,) Professor of Theology at the University of Freiburg. (*Der Pelagianismus nach seinem Ursprunge und seiner Lehre*, Freiburg, 1866.) The work is divided into

two parts of about equal size, the first of which treats of the "origin of Pelagianism," and the second of its "doctrine." The author rejects, as one-sided and untenable, the opinions prevailing among ancient Church writers concerning the origin of Pelagianism; that of Jerome, who derived it particularly from the errors of Origen, and of Jovinian, as well as the opinion of Marius Mercator, who regarded the theology of the Syrians, especially of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, as its chief source. The attempt of some British and German scholars to connect Pelagianism genetically with the views of the Celtic Druids, is briefly dismissed as entitled to no consideration. More fully the author refutes the opinion of those who regard it as the natural result of the monasticism of the ancient Church. Finally, the claim of the Pelagians themselves, and of modern rationalists who represent Pelagianism as the natural outgrowth of the anthropology of the first four centuries of the Church, is examined and refuted. Dr. Wörter admits that some of the Church writers of the first four centuries expressed views similar to or identical with those of the Pelagians; but their development into a system of heresies was the peculiar work of Pelagius. Wörter designates Pelagianism as a system of "unspeculative rationalism."

An interesting essay on the "History of the Monasteries on Mount Athos" has been published by Professor Gass of Giessen. (*Zur Geschichte der Athos-Klöster*, Giessen, 1865.) The work is divided into three parts: 1. From the first settlement of hermits and monks upon Athos in the ninth century until the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins. 2. From that period until the fall of the Byzantine empire. (In this section the controversy of Hesychasti is fully discussed.) 3. From the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks until the present day. The third section is followed by a report on the present condition of the monasteries and their inhabitants, as well as on the great literary treasures still preserved in the monasteries, and thus far only partly known.

The first good biography of Martin Chemnitz, the greatest disciple of Melanchton, and the best polemical writer of the German Protestant Church of the sixteenth century, has just been published by Dr. Leutz. (*Dr. Martin Kemnitz.* Gotha, 1866.) In the great collective work on the "Fathers and Founders of the Lutheran Church," only a brief sketch of Chemnitz is given by Dr. Pressel.

The number of German Lutheran theologians who advocate the introduction of an episcopal form of government into the German Lutheran Church is increasing. An important work has been published on this subject by Dr. Haupt, Lutheran pastor at Gronau. (*Der Episcopat der Deutschen Reformation.* Vol. 1, 1863. Vol. 2, 1866.) In the first volume the author endeavored to show that the Church constitution which the founders of the German Lutheran Church desired to establish, was the episcopacy of the Catholic and Universal Christian Church, freed from its anti-biblical abuses. He continues his argumentation in the second volume, undertaking, in particular, to prove that the Articles of Schmalkalden do not differ with regard to this point from the Augsburgh Confession and the Apology.

A new work by Dr. Mangold, professor of theology at Marburg, on "the Epistle to the Romans, with the Origin of the Church of Rome," (*Der Römerbrief*, 1866,) is highly recommended by the Protestant press of Germany for clearness and thoroughness. The author arrives at the result, that the congregation to which Paul's epistle was addressed consisted chiefly of Jewish Christians, but that the influence of the epistle led to a complete victory of the Gentile Christianity.

The historical development of Materialism, from its first origin in the ancient philosophy of Greece until the sensualistic and materialistic systems of our times, is the subject of a new work by F. A. Lange. (*Geschichte des Materialismus.* Iserlohn, 1866.) Of the ante-Christian representatives of materialistic views, it is especially the systems of Epicurus and Lucretius, of which a full account is given. The materialistic writers of the seventeenth century, as Gassendi, Hobbes, de la Mettrie, are sketched with great minuteness. With Kant's philosophic *critique* of Materialism, the author begins the second period in the history of Materialism, in which men like Feuerbach, Vogt, Moleschott, Büchner, Czolbe made the attempt to build up a scientific system of Materialism. This part is, how-

ever, deficient in point of completeness, as the Positivism of A. Comte is but briefly mentioned, and the English school of Secularists not referred to at all. The author opposes some of the assertions of the Materialistic schools, and recognizes the beneficent influence of Christianity upon society, but stands on the whole upon a decidedly rationalistic and skeptical standpoint.

---

## ART. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW. July, 1866.—1. The Being of God. 2. The Fullness of the Time. 3. Raphael Sanzio. 4. The Reformed Church of France. 5. The Name of the Lord. 6. The General Assembly at St. Louis.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, July, 1866. (Philadelphia.)—1. Rationalism. 2. Normal Schools. 3. Relations of India with Greece and Rome. 4. M'Cosh on J. S. Mill and Fundamental Truth. 5. The General Assembly.

BOSTON REVIEW, July, 1866. (Boston.)—1. Frederick William Robertson. 2. The Art of Not Growing Old. 3. The Reserved Force in the Scriptures, and A Plea for their Study. 4. God in Vegetable Life. 5. Amusements. 6. The Archæology of the Trial and Crucifixion of Christ. 7. The Demoniacs of the New Testament. 8. The True Theory of the Soul, and of Regeneration, and of Conversion; their Mutual Relations. 9. Short Sermons.

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1866. (Gettysburg.)—1. Baptism. 2. The Lord's Supper. Translated from the German of Luther. 3. The Atonement. 4. The Scriptural Idea of the Ministry. Translated from the German of Prof. Dr. Plitt, of Bonn. 5. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. 6. At What Age should the Young be Confirmed? 7. The Lost Books mentioned in the Old Testament. 8. The Everlasting Covenant of Promise to David. 9. Is the Doxology in Matt. vi, 13, an Interpolation?

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY, July, 1866. (Dover, N. H.)—1. Future Life. 2. The Spirituality and Voluntaryism of the New Testament. 3. The Word of God. 4. Four Months in Camp. 5. Prophecy as a Proof of the Inspiration of the Scriptures. 6. The Boston Quarterly Meeting.

NEW ENGLANDER, July, 1866. (New Haven.)—1. The Relation of Thought to Language. 2. Divorce Legislation. 3. The Episcopal Church in New England: A Review of Dr. Harwood's Sermon at the Semi-centennial Celebration of the Consecration of Trinity Church, New Haven. 4. Review of Professor Fisher's Life of Benjamin Silliman. 5. Review of Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon," and the Replies of Manning and Newman. 6. Review of Renan's New Work on the Apostles.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, July, 1866. (Boston.)—1. The Means of Grace. 2. If Endless Punishment is not Revealed in the Old Testament it is not in the New. 3. The Discourses of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. 4. Demonology of the Hindoos, Buddhists, and Chaldeans. 5. The Relations of Conscience to Revealed Law. 6. Forgiveness. 7. British Neutrality during the Rebellion.

## *English Reviews.*

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, July, 1866. (London.)—1. Strauss, Schleiermacher, and Renan. 2. Josephus as a Man and as a Historian. 3. Bushnell on Vicarious Sacrifice. 4. Scripture Exposition—The Aristotelian and Baconian Methods. 5. The Church History of the Celts as a Race. 6. Dr. Gardiner Spring. 7. Ecce Homo. 8. Literature of the Sabbath Question, (Second Article.) 9. Rome and her Annus Mirabilis, 1866. 10. The Organ Question, Pro and Con.

British Quarterly Review, July, 1866. (London.)—1. Ireland. 2. The Author of "John Halifax." 3. Auguste Comte. 4. Congregationalism, English and American. 5. The Recent Financial Panic. 6. Professor Boole. 7. Reform and the State of Parties.

Christian Remembrancer, July, 1866. (London.)—1. The Architect of St. Peter's. 2. Paley's Iliad and Hayman's Odyssey. 3. New Testament: Sources of the Greek Text and English Version. 4. Bishop Grosseteste. 5. Ecce Homo. 6. The Results of Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon. 7. Youth as depicted in Modern Fiction. 8. Walker's Liturgy of Sarum.

Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, July, 1866.—1. The French Oratorians: Richard Simon. 2. The Historical Character of the Gospels tested by an Examination of their Contents. 3. Difficult Passages in Job. 4. Pantheism: Pantheism in General. 5. Theory of Inspiration drawn from Scripture. 6. Two Views of "Ecce Homo." 7. The Almanzi Collection of Hebrew Manuscripts in the British Museum. 8. Early English Religious Poetry. 9. Correspondence on Lev. xi, 3–7, and Deut. xiv, 6–8. 10. Remarks on Phil. ii, 6, 7.

London Quarterly Review, July, 1866. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The Personal Life of Wellington. 2. The Huguenots at the Galleys. 3. Iron and Steel. 4. Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds. 5. Baker's Albert Nyanza. 6. Life of Bishop Wilson. 7. The Value of India to England. 8. Jamaica, its Disturbances and its Prospects. 9. The Change of Ministry.

Edinburgh Review, July, 1866. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Mohammed. 2. Weather Forecasts and Storm Warnings. 3. Annals of the Huguenots. 4. Mill's Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy. 5. Baker's Exploration of the Albert Nyanza. 6. The American Navy in the late War. 7. Precious Stones. 8. Charles Lamb. 9. The State of Europe.

From the researches of M. Caussin de Percival, Dr. Sprenger, and others, the world has become better acquainted both with the antecedents and personal character and history of Mohammed. He does not improve upon acquaintance, as some extracts from the first article of the Review may demonstrate.

### Mohammed as compared with other Religious Founders.

As he assumed the character of a prophet, one is naturally led to compare him with the mighty spiritual leaders of the chosen people of his own Semetic race, whose majesty Michael Angelo has fitly been able to interpret—with Moses, with Elijah, with Isaiah, and with Ezekiel; yet the Arabian is but a sorry and barbarous counterfeit of these grand types of humanity. One chapter of Hosea or Amos contains more grandeur of soul and more literary value than the whole of the Coran. Thus, in his highest flights, Mohammed never rises above the dignity

of a coarse and ignorant imitation of a Hebrew prophet; while in his lowest abasement, as in the scenes of the massacre of the Coraitza, for example, he looms through history with the sanguinary darkness of a king of Dahomey or Ashantee. As the founder of a religion, it would be blasphemy to name him in the same breath with one to whom he presumed to declare himself a rival, of whose mission and incarnation he could appreciate neither the beauty, the spotlessness, nor the truth. Place side by side a narrative of the origin of Christianity and a narrative of the origin of the faith of Islam, and without another word of argument the divinity of the one and the humanity of the other are apparent. But if we compare Mohammed with another founder of a religion, Bouddha, Bouddha appears, in his doctrine of self-abnegation and in his spiritual conception of human nature and the destinies of man, to stand as much above Mohammed as Mohammed does above the founder of American Mormonism. As in Mohammed's moral conduct of life, so in all his religious conceptions, there is a coarseness and grossness suited only to the semi-barbarous nations who have remained faithful to his creed. The distinguishing mark, however, of Mohammed's whole life and character is a savage incongruity; he was a strange mixture of barbarity and gentleness, of severity and of licentiousness, of ignorance and elevation of character, of credulity and astuteness, of ambition and simplicity of life, of religious conviction and low imposture; but the most astonishing trait of his character, and that which made him indeed a great man, was an invincible belief in himself, in the ever-present protection and favor of God, and in the destiny of the religion he was to found.

### His Difficulties as a Preacher.

When he began to make open claims, however, to inspiration, the assumption, of the prophetic character was at first treated by his skeptical tribesmen with unrestrained ridicule and contempt. "Here comes the son of Abdallah," they would say, "with the last news from heaven." They would ask him "what the weather would be a week hence," "what the price of the markets would be next fair-time," and tell him he had a fine opportunity of making a fortune. They would also bring him a pregnant woman, and ask him whether the child would be a male or a female; and they would offer, with an air of too benevolent interest, to send for a doctor for him to take care of his health. When, to make more impression on their incredulity, Mohammed began to talk of the resurrection, they said, "If our fathers are going to live again, bring us back one or two of them and we will believe." He then began to recite stories of the destruction of wicked races who had refused to listen to their prophets, of the destruction of the world in the time of Noah, of the destruction, by showers of stones, of the Thamudites, a race recorded in the Rolls of the Hanyfs, for refusing to listen to the voice of Houd their prophet; of the similar destruction of the Adites, a race equally celebrated in the books of the Hanfys. To such reasoning, and to actual menaces of temporal punishment, they would reply, "Let it rain stones, let the sky come down, and then we will see." When the temporal punishments with which he menaced them were so long in coming that their incredulous spirits grew more sarcastic still, he began to talk of the approach of the day of the last judgment; and for this topic, by the aid of the poetry and vigor of his style, he obtained a great degree of attention, for no race were ever more carried away by beauty of language and grace of style than the Arabs.

### His Embarrassment on the Subject of Miracles.

Said the Coreishites, coming round him, "Since you pretend to have a mission from Allah, give us some proof that such is the case. Our valley is narrow and barren, ask God to make it wider, that he thrust back the two chains of mountains which close it up, that he make rivers flow here equal to the rivers of Syria and Irak; or that some of our ancestors, with Cossai among them, shall revive to recognize you as a prophet, then we will do so too." Mohammed said that God had not intrusted him with any such power, but only to preach the law. "At least," continued the Coreishites, "demand of thy Lord that some one of his angels shall come and bear witness to your truth, and order us to place belief in you; or ask

him to dispense you from being obliged to seek your daily bread like the least of us." "No," said Mohammed, "I will make no such request; my duty is only to preach!" "Well, then, let thy Lord cause the heavens to fall upon us, as thou sayest he can; but we will not believe thee."

Article Sixth is a spirited sketch of the achievements of the American Navy during the late Civil War, with an ample admission of the great developments made by American genius in the art of naval warfare. It admits, in regard to the Miantonimah, now in British waters, that "it must be confessed that there is not a vessel in the British navy which could destroy her by gunnery, or which she could not destroy." The article concludes with the following paragraph:

We in England, if entering into a struggle for that supremacy of the seas which involves the preservation of our own coasts from danger, and the protection of a vast and wide-spread commerce, must look to meeting not a raw seceding province, but powers who are ready to attack, and will allow us brief space to prepare. A sufficient fleet must in such event be ready, not waiting the chances of a hurried creation. Be then the shock what it may, we doubt not it would be met by hearts as brave, by heads as cool, and arms as skillful, as those of the seamen whose exploits we have here briefly traced. The jealousies of a day, we trust, will die, while common blood and language will create new ties; and Englishmen who desire this, will not be slow to recognize as worthy successors of our own great naval chieftains, those names which now fill with pride the hearts of our kinsfolk on the other side of the Atlantic.

This is a painfully elaborated compliment, standing in striking contrast with the unmeasured insolence of this same periodical during our terrible trial. We think that Americans of the present generation are no way proud of the relationship to such "kinsfolk." We did once suppose that there was a true sympathy in their spirit with us; but under all its professed display, the experiment shows that there lay in the heart, certainly, of the oligarchic classes, both political and intellectual, a perfect readiness for our destruction at the arrival of opportunity. Nothing can obliterate that historical fact. Not such, however, is the American feeling against the English *people*. There is one result, for which the key-note is already sounding, which will harmonize us. "MANHOOD SUFFRAGE" (which is yet to reconcile our own sections) will make the two nations brothers.

## *German Reviews.*

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE, (JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.) 1. PREGER, Critical Studies on Master Eckhart. 2. DR. LOCHNER, Letters from the Abbess Sabina to her Brother Willibald Pirkheimer. 3. DR. HAHN, Pope Innocent III. and the Canonical Law. 4. KLEMME, Sects within the Evangelical Church.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1866. Fourth Number.—1. ZAHN, Papias of Hieropolis. 2. HAUCK, On Galatians iii, 20. 3. BINDSEIL, Remarks on Luther's "*Tischreden.*" 4. KOSTLIN, Review of Dr. F. C. BAUR's Lectures on New Testament Theology. 5. HAUCK, Review of Ohly "*Pastoral Journal for the Evangelical Church.*" 6. MERZ, The Basel Missionary Society.

IN the discussion on the authenticity of the books of the New Testament the testimony of Papias is of particular importance, as he was one of the earliest of the post-apostolic writers. But important as his testimony is, little is known of the man and of his work, of which only a few fragments have been preserved. It was, therefore, well worth the while to make "Papias of Hierapolis, his Historical Position, his Work, and his Testimony on the Gospels," the subject of a monograph, as has been done, in the first article of the above number of the *Studien*, by Th. Zahn, a "Repetent" at the University of Gottingen. As regards the history of Papias, the author of the article finds that he was born about 80 A. D., and grew up at Ephesus, together with his friend Polycarp, in the company of the aged apostle John. In the same city he had undoubtedly an opportunity to see other disciples of Christ, and to learn from them and commit to memory whatever they had to relate of Jesus. Soon after he must have gone to Hierapolis, for there he still met the daughters of the evangelist Philip, who, as early as the year 60 A. D. were called *παρθένοι*, (virgins.) This accords with a statement in the ancient chronicles, which state that Papias flourished as bishop in the times of Trajan. He continued his episcopal functions until the beginning of the reign of Marc Aurelius, when he died, after an episcopacy of nearly fifty years, probably a little before his friend Polycarp. His work, which was entitled *Λογιων κυριακων εξηγησεως συγγραμματα*, (Commentary to the Words of the Lord,) was probably compiled about the year 140.

The last article of the above number contains a very interesting history of the Basel Missionary Society. This society was the first among the German foreign missionary societies, and is still the largest. Four of its mission fields belong among the most interesting and most prosperous of Protestant Christianity. Its missionary seminary is probably the largest and the model establishment of the Protestant world. The history of this society is a most important contribution to the history of the propagation of Christianity in pagan countries during the nineteenth century. The missionary seminary had in January, 1865, eighty-eight pupils among whom were eight Armenians, one East Indian, one Chi-

nese. From 1816 the society has sent out four hundred and forty-one missionaries. It has in pagan countries three consistories, together with 6,032 congregations. Its total receipts from 1820 to 1865 were 12,000,000 francs. The whole sketch, extending over eighty pages, is an interesting contribution to the history of Protestant missions.

## *French Reviews.*

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*May* 1.—3. REVILLE, The Gospels before Modern Criticism. (First Article, The Fourth Gospel.) 5. TAINE, Italy and Italian Life. (Tenth Article, Venice and Venetian Painting.) 6. BLERZY, The War of Bhotan. 7. COCHUT, The Finances of the Italian Kingdom and the Papal Finances.

*May* 15.—2. TAINE, Italy and Italian Life. (Eleventh Article, Lombardy, Verona, Milan, and the Lakes.) 3. RECLUS, Natural Sentiment in Modern Society. 4. MME. DORA D'ISTRIA, The Albanians on both sides of the Adriatic, and the Albanian Nationality. 5. LEVEQUE, The Last Struggle of Paganism, the Reformers and the Martyrs of the Greek Religion.

*June* 1.—3. REVILLE, The Gospels before Modern Criticism. (Second Article, The Synoptical Gospels.) 7. CHEVALIER, The War and the European Crisis.

*June* 15.—1. ESQUIROS, England and English Life. (Thirtieth Article, English Missionaries.) 6. BOISSIER, Christianism and Christian Life in Gaul, according to Inscriptions prior to the Eighth Century.

*July* 1.—3. RENAN, Joachim de Flore and the "*Everlasting Gospel.*" 5. MAURY, The Roman Roads in Italy and in Gaul.

*July* 15.—3. X. RAYMOND, The War of 1866. 4. NINET, The Cultivation of Cotton in Egypt and in India—Free Labor in the United States.

UNDOUBTEDLY one of the most remarkable religious movements of the middle ages was the sect which, claiming to be followers of the Abbot Joachim de Flore, pretended to reform the Church and the world by inaugurating, in the place of the Christian era, which they believed to have come to an end, the era of the Holy Ghost. Two books, called "The Everlasting Gospel," and the "Introduction of the Everlasting Gospel," were considered the principal works of the sect. M. Renan, in a prefatory note to this article, informs us, that in 1852, when he held an appointment in the Imperial library, he was requested by Victor Le Clerc, the Dean of the Faculty of Letters of Paris, who in the twenty-fourth volume of the *Histoire Littéraire de France*, had to speak of the "Everlasting Gospel," to find out what the manuscripts of the Imperial library contained on this question. Some time before his death M. le Clerc returned to M. Renan the essay which he had on that

occasion compiled, and authorized him to publish it. To those who take an interest in the Church history of the middle ages the subject is of absorbing interest. M. Renan first gives an account of the Abbot Joachim and his works, printed as well as manuscript, genuine and apocryphal. Joachim was generally regarded in the middle ages, and also by most of modern writers, as the author of the "Everlasting Gospel," a secret book, which it was thought was destined to supplant the doctrines of Christ. After examining all the works which were ascribed to Joachim by his contemporaries, M. Renan arrives at these conclusions:

1. The "Everlasting Gospel" denoted, in the opinion of the thirteenth century, a doctrine ascribed to the Abbot Joachim concerning the inauguration of a third religious era, which was to follow the gospel of Christ, and to serve as the final law for mankind. 2. This doctrine is but vaguely contained in the genuine writings of Joachim, who contents himself with comparing the Old and the New Testaments, and only casts timid looks upon the future. 3. The name of the Abbot Joachim was, toward the middle of the thirteenth century, made use of by a party of enthusiasts in the Franciscan Order, for their purposes. They made him predict the birth of Francis of Assis and his order, and they ascribed to him, with regard to Francis, a mission like that of John the Baptist with regard to Jesus. Finally, they gave to the doctrine the name of the "Everlasting Gospel." 4. This name, in the opinion of most who heard it or used it, did not designate a particular book, but a doctrine. 5. Nevertheless, in a restricted sense, the name of "Everlasting Gospel" was also given to a collection of the chief works of Joachim. 6. Distinct from this collection was the "Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel," a middle-sized work which was compiled, or at least made public, in the year 1254, by Gerard de Borgo San-Donnino. 7. This Introduction was the preface of an abridged edition of the works of Joachim, accompanied with notes by Gerard. These two works, composed under the joint name of the "Everlasting Gospel," were referred in 1254, by the Bishop of Paris, to the Pope, and condemned by a Papal commission at Anagni in 1255. 8. The original of the "Introduction into the Everlasting Gospel" is lost, but its doctrine has been preserved to us in the acts of the Assembly of Anagni, and in the other censures which were pronounced against the Everlasting Gospel. Church historians will have to examine whether these conclusions can be accepted; but the article is at all events valuable for its copious extracts from the manuscripts of Paris, for its full statement of the doctrine of the Everlasting Gospel, and for

its information on the reformatory party among the Franciscans, and on the history of the Joachimists. Copious extracts are also given of the Chronicles of Brother Salimbene, a Joachimist, which was for the first time published at Parma, in 1857, and sheds much light on the history of this religious movement.

## Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

### *Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*Natural Theology;* or, The Existence, Attributes, and Government of God, including the Obligations and Duties of Men; Demonstrated by Arguments drawn from the Phenomena of Nature. By Luther Lee, D.D., Professor of Theology and Biblical Literature in Adrian College, Michigan. 24mo., pp. 186. Syracuse: Wesleyan Publishing House. 1866.

Dr. Lee was, before the rise of the antislavery controversy, a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, remarkable for his pulpit ability and rare argumentative vigor. To his work on Universalism our own young manhood owed great aid and obligation in forming sound opinions. The present manual is an outline of the standard argument of natural theology, constructed by the learned author as a text-book for instruction. It presents the argument with great clearness of logic, in an admirable order, and with brevity, clearness, compactness, and force. It is written in a grave, firm style of pure transparent thought, without the slightest hue of imagination. The manual is of course too brief to meet the atheistic argument as presented in its modern form by Herbert Spencer and the school to which he belongs. Its value consists in the clear outline of the primitive argument.

*The Home Life:* In the Light of its Divine Idea. By James Baldwin Brown, B. A., Minister of Clayland's Chapel, Clapham Road, London. Author of "The Divine Life in Man," etc. 16mo., pp. 327. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Baldwin Brown is one of the most impressive writers and preachers of the British pulpit. His sentences are brilliant bolts, and his paragraphs are batteries of telling home truths. His theology is in fact, on most points, eminently coincident with that of our own Church. We trust the Appletons will publish his whole series.

## *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Michael Servetus.* Eine aktenmässige Darstellung des 1553 in Genfgegen ihn geführten Criminal processes. Von Dr. KARL BRUNNEMANN. 4to., pp. 80. Berlin. 1865.

It would doubtless take many thousands of dollars to purchase all that has ever been printed about Michael Servetus and Calvin's complicity with the Genevan Council in his condemnation to death, and still scarce a year passes without adding to the literature of the subject. The year 1864, being the tercentenary of Calvin's death, was particularly fruitful in apologies for the great Genevan Reformer, some of which were characterized by such ignorance, ignoration, or intentional falsification, of established historical data, as to call forth new works on the other side, in which all the old Catholic and Libertine calumnies against Calvin were rehashed and warmed over for renewed presentation. These new partisan productions have so confused the public mind that an impartial historical account of the whole affair seems a greater desideratum than ever before. Even late writers of Church history, from whom we have a right to expect a greater degree of historical impartiality than from the mere biographer, manifest as much heated and perverse prejudice as the theological pamphleteers of the seventeenth century. Thus, for example, Sudhoff, in his "Lectures upon Ecclesiastical History," (Frankfort, 1862, vol. ii, p. 355 ss.,) asserts that it was Calvin's political enemies who arrested Servetus; that the criminal process was commenced against Calvin's will; that Calvin had nothing to do with the matter except when consulted by the Council, [his "political enemies;"] in fact, that it was not Calvin who demanded the death of Servetus, but *vice versa*, Servetus who demanded the death of Calvin!! All of which is just as true to history as if he had asserted that Calvin was the man whom they actually burned at the stake, and not Servetus. On the other hand, Dr. William Zimmermann, in his "Life-History of the Church of Jesus Christ," (Stuttgardt, 1859, vol. iv, p. 498, ss.,) accuses Calvin of outright "Satanism," and lauds Servetus as a martyr to the "freedom of thought and conscience." Of Castellio's and Socinus's bitter attack upon the "new pope of Geneva," Dr. Z. says: "How refreshingly and beautifully beams forth from this production, directed against the bloody Calvinian mania for persecution, the *genuine Christian spirit*! What profound acquaintance with Holy Scripture!" (P. 503.) Such being the partisan spirit which pervades and discolors the latest historical delineations of Calvin's relation to Servetus, we

can but think that Dr. Brunnemann has rendered the public a thankworthy service by the issue of the above-named little work, in which he presents us with a narration of the entire trial, *based upon the original documents.*

It is a fact too little heeded by writers on this topic, that most of the descriptions of Servetus's trial written before the year 1844 are as good as worthless, inasmuch as their authors drew more largely upon hearsay and their own imaginations than upon the official and authentic records thereof. These records were generally supposed to be irrecoverably lost, until Rilliet de Candolle, in 1843, chanced to light upon them in the archives of the Genevan government. In the following year he published the first authentic documentary history of the famous process under the title, "*Relation du procès criminel intenté à Genève en* 1553 *contre M. Servet, rédigée d'après les documents originaux.*" *Genève*, 1844. Dr. Brunnemann seems to have drawn his materials mostly from this important work. He would have done us a yet greater favor had he taken pains to procure an exact copy of the original manuscript records, and then published them *verbatim et literatim*, with suitable historical and literary introductions, annotations, etc. Until this shall be done the work of Rilliet will doubtless remain the standard authority in all questions relating to the trial. It is a grave, one may say an inexcusable, defect of Dr. Stähelin's new "Life of Calvin," (Elberfeld, 1862, 2 vols. 8vo.,) that it entirely ignores the light thrown by Rilliet upon this part of Calvin's life and character. Henry's learned biography appeared too early to enjoy the benefit of Rilliet's researches, and could only allude to them in an appendix, which, if we rightly recollect, our English and American editions quietly omit.

According to the authentic documentary evidence presented by Rilliet and Brunnemann, the following facts are established beyond all possibility of successful refutation: namely, that Calvin wrote to Farel, seven years before the dreadful tragedy, that in case Servetus should come to Geneva, he, (Calvin,) so far forth as his authority availed, would never suffer him to leave the city alive. (*Nam si venerit, modo valeat mea autoritas, vivum exire nunquam patiar.*) The letter was written February 13, 1546; (See Henry, Leben Calvins, Bd. 3 Beilage s. 66;) that Servetus came to Geneva, not as a revolutionary, but as a fugitive from the inquisitors of France; that he had no design to disturb the peace of Church or State in Switzerland, but that, on the contrary, he was very anxious to remain unrecognized until he could complete his arrangements for the prosecution of his flight to

Naples; that having ventured to go into a church to hear a sermon, he was recognized, and at Calvin's instance arrested; that Calvin, to spare himself certain inconveniences connected with the rôle of accuser, put forward his body-servant and amanuensis, Nicolas de la Fontaine, in this character; that Calvin composed the accusation; and that Rigod, the attorney who in the name of the republic commenced the prosecution, and Colladon, the advocate employed to support the accusation, were both intimate friends of Calvin; that, at a certain stage of the proceedings, Calvin, finding that Berthelier was using his influence to secure Servetus's acquittal, threw off the mask and appeared as the real accuser of the prisoner; that when the matter had been referred by the Council to the other Swiss Churches, Calvin used his influence epistolarily to secure a verdict unfavorable to Servetus; and that, having accomplished the destruction of the poor heretic, he gloried in the part he had taken in the matter, and wrote in defense of the principle of exterminating such wretches by the sword. (*Defensio orth. fidei contra errores Serveti, ubi ostenditur, hæreticos jure gladii coercendos esse.*—1854. *Corpus Ref.*, vol. viii, p. 362.).

These things are simply *facts* which cannot be gainsayed. They are painful facts to every right-minded Protestant; but the more the blind apologists of Calvin attempt to deny them, or gloze them over, or cover them up, the more the lovers of historic verity will herald them forth to the world. On the other hand, it is also a historic fact that Calvin did not wish to have Servetus *burned alive*. He believed that every end of justice and expediency would be equally well attained by a less excruciating death. When appealed to for the last time by the Council, before the decisive vote was taken, he advised the execution of the heretic, but desired that it should not be by burning. Neither is there any proof that Calvin was actuated, as has so often been alleged by his enemies, by feelings of *personal hatred* and rancor. He no doubt believed that the glory of God and the safety of the Reformed Church demanded the death of so grave and able an errorist. With his theocratic views of government, it was perfectly consistent one day to hang a murderer and the next to burn a heretic. There seems to be no proof that he was responsible for the cruelly neglectful treatment to which Servetus was subjected during his imprisonment, or that he was guilty of taunting his unfortunate opponent after the sentence had been pronounced. All such stories are doubtless calumnies invented by his enemies. Whether there is any truth in the story, related by Audin, and

all the other Catholic writers, that Calvin watched the progress of the execution from his open window, we have not been able to learn. Even if it is true, it by no means proves that he "gloated" over the scene, as these writers express it.

To all who wish a *reliable* history of this sad episode in the history of the Swiss reformation, we can conscientiously recommend Dr. Brunnemann's impartial narration. The work might easily have been rendered more valuable to professional theologians, but for students and general readers it is invaluable as it is.

---

*Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments.* Ein biblish-theologischer Versuch, von WILLIBALD BEYSCHLAG. 8vo., pp. xlii, 260. Berlin: Rauch. 1866.

The "*Kirchentag*" of 1864 will long be remembered. It met, as many of our readers will recollect, in Altenburg. Professor Beyschlag, of Halle, an esteemed representative of the evangelical school, had been appointed to open the discussion of the main question in the programme: "What profit can the Evangelical Church derive from the recent works on the life of Christ?" and great were the expectations. The occasion, the theme, the man, everything seemed to conspire to heighten the interest of the convention. In due time Professor Beyschlag is introduced, and proceeds, in a very elaborate discourse of over an hour's duration, to exonerate Strauss and Rénan from the charge of conscious hostility to Christ, and to expose the untenableness of the orthodox Christology! He tells his astounded hearers—and they embraced the flower of the evangelical theologians of Germany—that they must learn from these works a profounder appreciation of the veritable humanity of Christ; that they must abandon the old idea of his personal pre-existence and of his co-equality with the Father; in fine, that they must present the word with a *conceivable* Christ! (*Comp. Meth. Quart. Rev.*, 1865, pp. 117, 118.)

The consternation, confusion, and furore called forth by this discourse may more easily be imagined than described. A stormy discussion followed. Some wished the Diet to "bear witness" against the obnoxious production; some believed in free debate. The final unceremonious dropping of the matter was satisfactory to none. The sensation spread to all parts of the country. Schenkel was angry because Professor Beyschlag had esteemed his work so lightly, and he vented his spite in his own inimitable style. The outspoken rationalists regarded the whole affair as a capital joke; the confessional party saw in it a new proof that the German Church has no safeguard for her orthodoxy except in the hallowed

old creeds of the Reformation; the evangelicals were grieved, chagrined, indignant. Every religious press discussed the matter from its own peculiar point of view. Many of the reviews of Professor Beyschlag's discourse were in truth superficial, passionate, and unfair. To have replied to them in detail would have involved the poor professor in an endless warfare, tedious to himself and more so to the public. He therefore set himself to work to produce a connected and systematic work on the Christology of the New Testament, which should at once establish the biblical character of the christological views advanced at Altenburg, and vindicate his reputation from all the attacks of his assailants. The work before us is the result.

The preface of forty-two pages contains a review of his more prominent critics, to wit, Schenkel, Weisse, and Hengstenberg, and a reply to their various strictures upon his Altenburg discourse. The tone of his defense is dignified yet earnest, its conduct skillful and apparently honest. At its close he endeavors to state his views of the Trinity, and certainly succeeds in freeing himself from the charge which has been preferred against him of being a "Cerinthian," "Socinian," etc. Then comes an introduction of seven pages on the present state of the christological question, and the principles upon which he has constructed his work. The body of the book is made up of eight sections or chapters bearing the following superscriptions: 1. The idea of the Son of Man; 2. Jesus's testimony respecting himself, according to the synoptical Gospels; 3. His testimony respecting himself, according to John; 4. The Petrine Christology; 5. The Christology of the Apocalypse; 6. The Johannean Christology; 7. The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews; 8. The Christology of Paul. A "conclusion" of three pages presents some of the apologetical advantages claimed in behalf of his view of the person and history of Christ.

It was confidently prophesied by some of Professor Beyschlag's critics, that he would not be able to maintain himself upon the standpoint taken at Altenburg, and that he would in all likelihood repeat the history of Schenkel, who, at first deviating from his evangelical brethren only in trifling matters of opinion, has step by step come to be the head of a great rationalistic party. How far this prophecy is true the future alone can show. As the present production is in reality little else than an attempt to establish the biblical character of the christological views advanced in Altenburg only a little more than a year ago, it is of course too early to look for any noticeable modification of them. He still

teaches, as there, that Christ pre-existed, but not personally; that he is divine, but not co-equal with the Father. Hs still regards Christ not as a mere man, but as the ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, not as a creature, but as the ἀρχή τῆς κτίσεως. He holds that God is triune but not tripersonal; that the Holy Spirit is a real hypostasis of the Godhead, but not possessed of proper personality. The most serious *new* development of heterodoxy presented in the new work, is his rejection of large portions of the sacred canon and his depreciation of other portions which he retains. For instance, he rejects as spurious not only the Second Epistle of Peter, but also the pastoral epistles of Paul *en masse;* he regards neither the Epistle to the Hebrews nor the Apocalypse as of apostolic authorship; and as to the Gospels, the fourth is the only one which bears the seal of apostolic authority. How long he has cherished these views of the canon he does not inform us; that they have been adopted since the Altenburger *Kirchentag* we have no reason to assume.

To briefly sum up our judgment of the book we will simply say, *first*, that its title seems to us a misnomer. With all its merits in point of thoroughness and critical circumspection, the work is not an unbiased development and exhibition of the "*Christology of the New Testament*," but an ingenious and learned defense of Willibald Beyschlag's christological thesis as proposed at Altenburg. In the *second* place, the results attained seem to us to have just that kind of plausibleness which those of Arian and Socinian christologians have, and *no other*. *Thirdly*, we cheerfully accord to the author the credit of diligence, candor, and an honest zeal for the cause of Christian truth as he understands it. The further development of the controversy we shall watch with the liveliest interest.

## *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

*Homes Without Hands.* Being a Description of the Habitations of Animals, Classed according to their Principles of Construction. By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M. A., F. L. S., etc., Author of the "Illustrated Natural History," "Common Objects of the Sea-Shore and Country," etc., etc., etc. With new Designs by W. F. Keyl and E. Smith; engraved by Messrs. Pearson. 8vo., pp. 651. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This volume unfolds, both in verbal description and in copious pictorial illustrations, a beautiful and a wonderful department in nature. Every living being has its home, and after its own skillful

fashion builds, or digs, or otherwise effects its home. The curious shapes given to these homes are visibly exhibited and graphically described in these pages. Not the student in nature or the lover of beauty alone will find a rich entertainment. The theologian, the metaphysician, the devout thinker, will find here rich material for reflection, for argument, and for devotional meditation. How is it that the beautiful structures of many an animal surpass the creations of art, and show the results of a far-reaching reason in a particular direction, without the steps of a reasoning process? Who or what supplies the conclusion without the deduction or the induction? Who does the ratiocination for the skillful winged architect? Is it not the Divine Mind that furnishes to instinct its conclusions?

## *History, Biography, and Topography.*

*Life and Times of Andrew Johnson*, Seventeenth President of the United States. Written from a national Standpoint. By a National Man. 12mo., pp. 363. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

This volume is unmistakably a "campaign document," and is a favorable specimen of that species of literature. It pictures the humble origin of Mr. Johnson, and traces the steps by which, with blended natural energy and lucky accident, he finds himself placed at the apex of the national pyramid; and the writer, like a skillful romancer, leaves his hero at his zenith. At that zenith Mr. Johnson (the writer does not add) had a rare opportunity, such as seldom happens to mortal, to place himself in the zenith of history. His memorable menaces to "render treason odious" had so much the accent of personal vengeance, that we did not admire the utterance. Had he called Congress together, and, as a unit with the representatives of the people, prescribed the terms of "impartial suffrage and general amnesty" to the South, the entire South might at this hour have had her representatives in Congress, and our unified nation might have already commenced her career on the high road of universal freedom, and national "fraternity" in Church and State. These terms would have been cheerfully accepted at the South. They would made have the nation one; and *Johnson the Enfranchiser* would have stood in historic immortality side by side with Lincoln the Emancipator. For this illustrious destiny he was too little a statesman and too much a politician. He has veered from his first high purpose, and has re-established the obsolete interests that first prompted the South to war. He has

recalled to life those southern feelings and policies from which the "irrepressible conflict" springs, and the antagonism is awakened that may land us in a second civil contest.

By impartial suffrage we mean not unconditioned universal suffrage, but suffrage irrespective of color, based on just and safe, but liberal, qualifications. Such qualifications would doubtless even in those few states where colored men are a majority, retain the predominance largely on the side of the white race, while it would be a guarantee for the civil rights of the colored race. Then a liberal policy of immigration, throwing open inviting inducements for the incoming of a European and northern yeomanry, would prevent the result so much a bugbear with the white southerner, the subjection of any state to African control. By such a course the policy and spirit of our nation, and our nation itself, would become ONE.

That we long cherished the hope of harmonization in State, aided by its counterpart in Church; that we earnestly advocated the spirit and the measures tending to such a harmonization, *on the high platform of freedom and right*, is to us a happy recollection. Its failure was no fault, no error, no mismanagement of ours. We took no step which we regret; we wrote no line which, "dying, we would wish to blot." That we were right is evident from this: that those who have assailed us as derelict to our high principles of freedom have ever evaded stating our true positions, namely, that we desired fraternity only on the basis of eternal truth and righteousness; that we never proposed to lower our platform to the level of slavery but to raise the southern platform to the plane of freedom. It took thirty years to bring the North Church to the true ground; with an open field and fair play the South Church would have come right in half the time. It has been a pet maxim with some that this is "*the Johnson policy in the Church.*" No, dear caviler, it is *the Jesus policy in the Church;* and it is the Johnson policy in the State, and the repellant policy in the Church, which to our profound sorrow have rendered its success, perhaps for the present generation, impossible.

The volume before us maintains that it was not by the slaveholders in the South that the proslavery agitation was excited and maintained which "precipitated" the southern states into rebellion, but by the politicians. We suppose that to be true; and it shows that the precipitation took place more from the want of nerve and vigilance of the better classes, than from any real substantive interest that the South ever had to sever the nation in twain. And it is by

that same turbulent class, her politicians, aided by her uneducated, unprincipled loose population, that the South is again in deep danger of being victimized. Before these turbulent classes the true-hearted South, in State and Church, is compelled to succumb, and finally to accept and clamorously maintain the turbulent platform. That there is a true-hearted South, that would stand for truth, freedom, and union, were it not overslaughed by overwhelming forces, we have good reason to know. For and with that South we have the profoundest sympathy. We would gladly give it the right hand of "fraternity," and lead it through truth to triumph.

If we read Mr. Johnson's nature aright, he is and ever has been at bottom as intensely sectional a southerner as Robert Toombs or Jefferson Davis. But as those haughty oligarchs repudiated him as a "mean white," he denounced them at the crisis, and found himself compelled by the current to a broad radical position of defiance to the rebellion, adherence to the government, confiscation and division of great landed estates, the supremacy of southern loyalty, and even negro suffrage. When, however, he was placed at the head of the government, and southern oligarchy was prostrated at his feet in flattery and supplication, his full ancient nature repossessed him. The ancient dogma, that the oligarchy of the South shall rule the nation, again becomes an axiom. For this he has struggled to withdraw all protection from the southern negro; has opposed a constitutional amendment, in order to add twelve more votes to the South concentrated into the hands of the rebel oligarchy; and has opened an exterminating war upon the national Congress, authorizing his organs to menace a military *coup d'etat* unless the representatives of the people obey the menaces of their accidental dictator. He has placed a military equipment for 200,000 soldiers in the hands of the rebels.* Such are the alarming results of all our expenditure of blood and treasures. For four years of war we had the firm feeling that an honest patriot held our helm. Now the days are returned when our ruler is a traitor to the cause of truth and freedom, who stands to Buchanan as king Stork stands to king Log. His reign is cruel to the North, but far more misleading and destructive to the South; and the true patriots of both sections, just so far as they

* We are told by even southern good men that the secession war was not a rebellion, nor must its soldiers or advocates be called "rebels." But, practically, that helps not their case. More dangerous even than rebels, more to be abhorred and punished, are the men who persistently claim the right to demolish our national government when they please without incurring the responsibility of rebellion.

clearly realize their country's good, will unite in opposing his disastrous "policy."

So far as our Church is concerned, never on any great moral and political question, dividing the nation, were we so perfect a unit. Ministers and laymen, as citizens and voters, stand politically one; and morally one on the great moral question, underlying the political, whether manhood shall attain and possess its "unalienable rights." We shall through our various Church agencies—our missionary, church extension, and freedman's aid organizations—prosecute (in, we trust, the most Christian spirit) the great work of raising the humblest manhood of all our land to the full capacity for all its rights. The blood of our missionaries may again redden the southern fields; but the voice of that blood will awaken God and man to more decisive action. Not doubtful, and we believe not very far distant, is the beneficent result, in which the emancipated South as well as the North will have abounding cause of joy.

---

*Life and Letters of Leonidas L. Hamline, D. D.*, Late one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By WALTER C. PALMER, M. D. With Introductory Letters by Bishops MORIS, JANES, and THOMSON. 12mo., pp. 544. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

THIS publication is given to the Church in the best style of Carlton & Porter, by the pen of one of her devoted and useful laymen, and is an affectionate tribute to the memory of one of her eminent sons. Bishop Hamline was in his childhood carefully trained in the principles of religion; he was rigidly moral in his youth, and, at the age of sixteen, he united with the Congregational Church, of which his parents were members. Though he afterward doubted his conversion, he was active in religious duties, and, while yet in his minority, was instrumental in revivals in the schools where he was teacher. Becoming satisfied that he was not fitted for the ministry, for which his parents had designed him, he turned to the law, and in 1827 was admitted to the bar. Methodism, he had been taught, was a compound of ignorance and fanaticism; and at the age of thirty he knew Christianity only as expounded by the Calvinistic school. Edwards on the Will was, in his judgment, "the glory of the human mind." The free yet inevitable flowing of water down hill was one of his illustrations of our freedom. That it was useless to seek God was his logical conclusion. The perusal of Fletcher's Appeal, followed by a visit of curiosity to a camp-meeting, resulted in his awakening; and the death of a child, which he interpreted as a divine judg-

ment for his impenitence, alarmed him into a purpose to seek God. His conversion, nearly a month afterward, was clear and powerful. All the powers of his gifted mind were laid at the foot of the cross. He had no thought of preaching. License as exhorter and next as preacher was received unexpectedly and unsought. For a couple of years he preached as a "supply," and in 1832, at the urgent desire of his brethren, he entered the Ohio Annual Conference as a probationer. Most of his time was spent among the people. He would preach and lead class at every appointment on his six weeks' circuit, visiting pastorally in the intervals.

In the autumn of 1836 he was elected by the Ohio Conference associate editor of the Cincinnati Book Concern, and in 1840 the General Conference, of which he was a member, returned him to the same post, where he took charge of the Ladies' Repository. While in this office he freely went to the help of his brethren, preaching sometimes fifteen sermons in a week. In 1841, feeling the necessity of a greater divine power in his ministry, he sought the grace of entire sanctification. Thoroughly in earnest, he redeemed all possible time for prayer, and the midnight hour often found him with his face on the floor, in an agonizing struggle, pleading with God. And when the answer came it was indeed a baptism of fire. More than ever he now desired to preach Christ. "I see souls are sinking," he wrote, "I feel in a hurry to save them." In addition to his editorial duties, he at one time preached more than seventy sermons in two months, and even five in a single day. Such excessive toil prostrated his physical system, and brought him to the verge of the grave, depriving the Church of years of his valuable service.

In the General Conference of 1844 he delivered the great argument on the powers of the General Conference, which placed him in the episcopal chair. This high office he resigned in 1852, when ill health rendered him unable to discharge its functions. His brief career as bishop proved him a capable and popular presiding and executive officer; but the trait that distinguished him, and for which his visits to the conferences are especially remembered, was his great care for the spirituality of the Church and her ministry. He felt that his great work was to save souls. As one of the chief pastors of the Church, he sought to inspire the same conviction in the hearts of ministers and people. Living as if in the presence of eternity, it was but the outflowing of his soul to lead the minds of those around him, whether in the parlor or the conference room, to Christ and the great salvation. Some who did not know him, or who were of a different spirit, thought him inclined to ascet-

icism; but multitudes bowed their hearts before his words, and found the pearl of perfect love, while hundreds of ministers went from his presence to their charges to preach a full salvation as never before.

The manifest aim of Dr. Palmer, in the preparation of this volume, was to set forth the religious experience and life of Bishop Hamline as a witness and advocate of perfect love, and its entire structure is in harmony with that purpose. We are made to see the power of divine grace most wonderfully displayed in connection with great physical sufferings and most powerful temptations. We are often strangely left in ignorance of the nature of the temptations encountered, or of the conflicts passed through; but we do see the power of faith in Christ and the glory of the triumph it brings. This book cannot therefore well fail to profit the soul of him who reads it; it will be prized by the lover of holiness, and sought by the devout; and it will, we trust, stir many a sluggish heart to new devotion and zeal. We would not erase a line from the picture of the eminent holiness thus portrayed, but on laying down the volume we feel that we have had but a partial view of the man. We are not satisfied, for the whole of Bishop Hamline is not given us. As a biography of his friend, the author had undoubtedly a right to present him in such light as he pleased; but Bishop Hamline was the property of the Church, and one of her representative men. The Church had, therefore, a right to expect a biography which she might place in the hands of her members, her friends, and her children, and bid them know thoroughly the great man whom God had given her. From this general standpoint the book should have been written. We think its usefulness would have been wider and more enduring. W.

---

*The Life and Times of the Rev. Samuel Wesley, M.A.*, Rector of Epworth and Father of John and Charles Wesley, the Founders of the Methodists. By L. Tyerman. 8vo., pp. 472. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co., also 66 Paternoster Row. 1866.

Mr. Tyerman's volume is professedly "a labor of love." He is inspired with the conviction that while the mother of the Wesleys has been crowned with ample laurels, not undeserved, "due honor has never yet been paid to Samuel Wesley." That worthy personage has been regarded as "learned," but "often foolish;" as "pious," but "painfully eccentric, stern, and quarrelsome." To repair this great memorial wrong, our author has prepared this biography, giving as truly a full-length portraiture of his hero as his materials enable, enshrined in an ample back-ground of contemporary

English history, with a brief biography of every character with whom his Wesley comes in contact, so that we have the man with all his surroundings in the full light of day. It is a searching ordeal through which he is obliged to pass. Little did he expect that his inner and home life was ever to be so spread out to the gaze of a succeeding age. He is found to be amply human; but his misfortunes awaken our sympathy, and after all deductions he retains a claim upon our high esteem, and our regret that so much that was truly noble had not attained a more deserved allotment in life.

This, remember, was John Wesley's father. This Samuel Wesley's grandfather, Bartholomew Wesley, the first known Wesley, was a Cromwellian puritan preacher in Cromwell's time, and was ejected from his Church when Cromwell died and Charles Second became king. Bartholomew's son, John Wesley, was in character, as in name, a slight prototype of his own celebrated grandson, *the John*. This prior John Wesley died at the early age of thirty-four, leaving his son Matthew, our present Samuel, a protege in the hands of the Dissenters; whom however he left, and graduating at Oxford, married the daughter of Dr. Annesley, and became in time the rector of Epworth, and hero of Mr. Tyerman's volume.

This rector of Epworth possessed genius, piety, and talent that would have nobly adorned the primacy of the Church of England. His destiny was a salary of two hundred pounds and nineteen children; with a fine lot of subordinate destinies to match. His barn once fell and was demolished, his flax was burned, his house was twice burned, his income was diminished one half by the price of grain, his credit was destroyed, his debt was £300, for £30 of which he was flung into jail, during which imprisonment his enemies stabbed his cows, that his wife and children might be deprived of their sole remaining sustenance of bread and milk. Such are specimens of the life-struggles of the remarkable father of one of the most remarkable families, for the native talent of all its members, that ever existed on English soil. Still their entire record would have vanished from the memory of men but for the historic career of the two celebrated brothers.

Whether Mr. Tyerman raises Samuel Wesley to a much higher place in the world's estimation is a matter of fair doubt. In regard to talent and learning, he has received ample historic justice. In regard to mental balance, soundness of judgment, the doubt still remains. Mr. Tyerman is too honest to remould the facts, and the facts nearly confirm, in our estimate, the standing verdict. Take the

great patent fact, that with talent sufficient to have won a high place in literature, he wrote mainly an enormous poem which scarce escaped the Dunciad, and a huge commentary upon Job, which did not deserve probably the coarse satire of Warburton, but could not but deserve its burial in the dust of the libraries in which it was placed by the liberality of subscribing friends. There must also have been some "loose screw" that on more than one occasion secured him enmities so much beyond the ordinary measure. "It is an unhappiness almost peculiar to our family," said Mrs. Wesley, in a letter to her "Dear Jacky," "that your father and I seldom think alike." And such are the tokens which this illustrious woman gives of rare soundness of judgment, such were her powers of expressing firm, just thought in firm, just language, that posterity naturally and justly still inclines to the verdict that where they varied in view she was presumptively right.

Mr. Tyerman, after a full re-examination of the "noises" in Wesley's house, comes to the reluctant conclusion that they were "preternatural." No natural solution accounts for the facts. Southey gives as a reason why they were "permitted," their hopeful influence in convincing skeptics of the reality of a supernatural. Mr. Tyerman suggests as the reason, the importance that the founders of the future Methodist movement should be profoundly impressed with faith in such a reality. But why must we suppose that these phenomena were specially, and for an individual reason, "permitted?" Why is an aerolith "permitted" to pass the boundary line of the moon's attraction and alight upon the earth? Both the aerolith and the apparition exceptionally overpass the ordinary, and we may say natural, limits which divide two spheres. Each so overpasses, not by special divine *permission*, but because it happens to be in those conditions by which it can. We while living have a strange and wonderful repugnance to meeting a comer from the invisible world; in ordinary cases the disembodied spirit may have a stronger repugnance to disclosing itself to earthly view, except in certain instances or under certain inducements or compulsions. Or there may be required certain temperaments or predispositions in the living person to render it susceptible of being addressed, visibly or audibly, by a disembodied being. The laws or influences which separate the two regions of the embodied and disembodied, and the methods or possibilities of transition, can at the present time be only conjectured. These considerations may perhaps dispense with all efforts at explaining the special permissions in particular cases. The high-toned temperament of the Wesley family may suggest a reason why their home should receive a supernatural

visitant. Mr. Tyerman's pages furnish proof, in more than one place, of a "prophetic strain" in Samuel Wesley, especially upon his triumphant death-bed. From Mr. Tyerman's most interesting volume we rise as from a rich entertainment, with a warm love and admiration of the truly noble character he has portrayed. The book, we may add, is furnished with a beautiful likeness of Samuel Wesley. His noble figure is arrayed in a clerical gown; and what we take to be a study-cap surmounts his head, from beneath which there beams a powerful eye, lighting up a strikingly eagle-like set of features.

---

*Harpers' Pictorial History of the Great Rebellion.* By ALFRED H. GUERNSEY and HENRY M. ALDEN. Part First. To the Close of the Peninsula Campaign of 1862. Folio, pp. 380. New York: Harper and Brothers.

WE have here a *folio* of the nineteenth century, not ponderous and unwieldly, like its predecessors of former ages, clad in vellum and lettered in Latin, but light and portable, coated with sable cloth, and with type of the most modern model of the Harper press. The purpose of the folio size of page is to afford space for engravings of the largest practicable size, transferred from their ephemeral uses in Harper's Weekly to a permanent place in the present great historical work. This is the *pre-eminent peculiarity* of this work among the various rivals which have appeared narrating the stupendous events of the terrible four years. It presents a spacious page, without too unwieldly a weight, upon which the large movements are visibly reproduced. Before our eyes the "great rebellion" all but destroys our nation, and the great republic overwhelms the rebellion. Beginning with portraits of the illustrious men of North and South who laid the foundations of the indivisible Union, and a fac-simile of the Declaration of Independence, announcing the purpose of a revolution based not upon slavery but upon liberty, we are furnished with a superabundant series of portraits, maps, battle-fields, cities, forts, ships, batteries, with a miscellany of evolutions, scenes, and objects tending to present history in its most accurate and living form. The spirit of the narrative is patriotic, but no way vituperative upon the rebelling parties. It hesitates not to assume, in a calm but decisive tone, how great is the crime of aiming at our national destruction. Every effort has been used to secure an accurate statement of facts in order to preserve the perfect faith of history. Wherever gallantry, magnanimity, or Christian character have appeared on the adverse side, impartial justice has been accorded.

No fierce one-sidedness, no bombastic boasts or fiery invectives disfigure its pages. The volume terminates abruptly with an unfinished chapter of the "Peninsula Campaign," but will be followed in series by a line of successors, perhaps through the scenes of a second "civil war" in possible prospect before us.

---

*The American Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the year* 1865. Embracing Political, Civil, Military, and Social Affairs, Public Documents, Biography, Statistics, Commerce, Finance, Literature, Science, Agriculture, and Mechanical Industry. Vol. V. 8vo., pp. 850. New York: Appleton & Co. 1866.

An annual record, like this, of the events of the closing year, is a great public and private convenience, and deserves to be considered a national institution. It should be regularly taken, and placed in the libraries of our colleges and all other suitable places for reference. It is history chasing close upon the heel of events. Of course the military and political transactions of the government occupy the largest space; but the liberal scope of the work takes in every great department of national life. The work is ably and, we believe impartially performed.

---

## *Politics, Law, and General Morals.*

*Lectures on the Study of History.* Delivered in Oxford, 1859-60. By Goldwin Smith, M. A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. To which is added a Lecture delivered before the New York Historical Society, in December, 1864, on The University of Oxford. 12mo., pp. 309. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Goldwin Smith is one of the choice few of the intellectual aristocracy of England, who were not so blinded by a false national self interest as to ignore the fact that our great contest with slavery in the late civil war was a struggle for human liberty and American progress. The same clear-sightedness, produced by his unequivocal devotion to the cause of humanity, is exhibited in the present Lectures upon History. His purpose throughout is to refute the theories of Comte, Mill, and others, in Europe, followed by their disciple, Draper, in America, which assert that man is a necessary agent, and history but a necessary process of cause and effect, governed by as rigid a law of succession or causation as any mechanical series of movements. On the contrary, he maintains that man is free from the law of volitional necessity; and, hence, that history is not a process or a science of absolute law,

but is the unfolding, in aggregate events, of the free spirit of man. The course of a nation, like that of an individual, is not a series of fixed and fated movements, but a train of free alternative actions. In the third lecture he takes up the doctrine, maintained by the same class of thinkers, that Christianity is now, or soon will be, outgrown, and become obsolete in the advance of public improvement; and asserts, on the other hand, that Christianity, in its pure and primitive essence, is true and perfect, and cannot be superseded, either by any attainment of philosophy or by any substitute religion.

Upon the first of these two points, the freedom of the human agent, the professor enters with the argumentative energy of a spirited polemic. His treatment of the topic in his brief lectures is of course too limited and too popular to go to the bottom of the great subject. He clearly recognizes that the necessity of human volitions, upon which Edwards bases his Calvinism, is precisely the necessity upon which the atheistic school founds its doctrine of the laws of historical development. The latter do indeed adopt the more modern theory of *invariable succession* instead of that of *causational necessity;* but this only softens the rigidity of the doctrine in words and on the surface. At bottom both are the same one fatalism.

The following is Professor Smith's treatment of the statistical argument in favor of necessity:

> Great stress is laid by the Necessarians on what are called moral statistics. It seems that, feel as free as we may, our will is bound by a law compelling the same number of men to commit the same number of crimes within a certain cycle. The cycle, curiously enough, coincides with the period of a year which is naturally selected by the Registrar General for his reports. But, first, the statistics tendered are not moral, but legal. They tell us only the outward act, not its inward moral character. They set down alike under murder the act of a Rush or a Palmer, and the act of an Othello. Secondly, we are to draw some momentous inferences from the uniformity of the returns. How far are they uniform? M. Quetelch gives the number of convictions in France for the years 1826, '27, '28, '29, severally as 4,348, 4,236, 4,551, 4,475. The similarity is easily accounted for by that general uniformity of human nature which we all admit. How is the difference amounting to more than three hundred between one year and the next to be accounted for except by free will? But, thirdly, it will be found that these statistics are unconsciously but effectually garbled. To prove the law of the uniformity of crime, periods are selected when crime was uniform. Instead of four years of the Restoration, in which we know very well there was no great outburst of wickedness, give us a table including the civil war between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs, the St. Bartholomew, the Reign of Terror, or the days of June 1848. It will be said, perhaps, that this was under different circumstances; but it is a very free use of the term "circumstance" to include in it all the evil and foolish actions of men which lead to, or are committed in, a sanguinary revolution. Social and criminal statistics are most valuable; the commencement of their accurate registration will probably be a great epoch in the history of legislation and government; but the reason why they are so valuable is that they are not fixed by necessity, as the Necessarians allege or insinuate, but variable, and

may be varied for the better by the wisdom of governments—governments which Necessarians are always exhorting to reform themselves, instead of showing how their goodness or badness necessarily arises from the climate or the food. If the statistics were fixed by necessity, to collect them would be a mere indulgence of curiosity, like measuring all the human race when we could not add a cubit to their stature.

In his fourth lecture the professor discusses the question whether indeed our Christianity is to be antiquated by the advances of the human intellect. He admits that we are on the brink of great changes in religion. He is severe upon the narrowness of theologians, and the bitterness of the polemics which have divided the Christian Church into hostile sects; though, by the way, we must say that the professor himself is perhaps as earnest a polemic as most theologians upon questions in which his own mind is as interested; for instance, the old standing point between Calvinism and Arminianism, the freedom of the human will. He believes that a large amount of religious notion, unable to stand the test of criticism, will disappear. Yet Christianity, in its actual reality, the Christianity of the New Testament, he holds to be absolute truth and essential right; and, so far from being antiquated, will be confirmed by progressive thought. Christ is a pure and perfect exemplar, the true exhibition of complete virtue in actual life; and all that the advancing ages can do, is not to supersede but to attain to it. Our approaching great *crisis* consists therefore of the pangs, not of dissolution, but of regeneration. The false accretions of ages will disappear, and original Christianity will stand in its purity. He does not explicitly state what that purified Christianity doctrinally is. Perhaps his own mind is upon that point not very clear. We only are sure that he recognizes heartily the divine mission, the miraculous history, the perfect virtue, and the authoritative teachings of Christ.

Francis W. Newman in abandoning Christianity had denied the perfection of Christ's character. He even went so far as to select, as the superior of Jesus, Fletcher of Madeley! To this our professor replies, that Fletcher's character was produced by the model character of Jesus. He might have added that no blasphemy probably could have shocked the soul of Fletcher more than the assertion of his moral superiority over Jesus.

The professor seems to be somewhat graveled by the fact that Christianity has to be believed upon mere human testimony. His reply in effect is, that the resurrection of Christ is a consequence, necessarily true, of his moral perfection. But if the character of Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels be, as he maintains, truly perfect, the Gospels must necessarily be historically true. Upon this

point the argument of the author of Ecce Homo is a demonstration. The conception of a perfect moral model, indestructible by the criticism of all ages was absolutely, and, as we might say, infinitely, superior to the capacity of the evangelic writers of their age. And to this argument, as presented by the author of Ecce Homo in refutation of Straus and Renan, there is not, and there never can be, any adequate reply.

Professor Smith wrote before the battle of Sudowa had given an apparent death-stroke to the temporal power of the papacy; yet the death of that power he anticipated as an approaching condition of the restoration of Christianity to its original unity. He says:

> The chief historical conditions of its existence have expired, or are rapidly expiring. In the supremacy of human authority over reason in the mind of man, the power of Rome had its origin and being, and the supremacy of reason over human authority in the mind of man is now decisive and complete. The rationalistic theories of recent advocates of the papacy, such as De Maistre and Dr. Newman, are suicidal concessions to the spirit of a changed world. The loss of moral allegiance, even in countries nominally papal, has for some time past been continuous and rapid; and we ourselves well know the source whence the small, precarious, and equivocal accessions of strength have been derived.

He rejects the idea that a spiritual papacy can long survive the temporal, in the following terms:

> We might share the dream of a purely spiritual papacy if we did not know too well that the papal power, to whatever extent it may have been exercised for spiritual ends, was the creature of political accidents and political influences, aided by the instruments, not spiritual, though not strictly material, of religious intimidation and intrigue. The papacy will perish, and in it will perish the great obstacle to the reconciliation and reunion of Christendom. Nor will it perish alone. It will draw down with it in its fall, sooner or later, all these causes of division which have subsisted by mere antagonism to it, and many which it has kept alive by its direct though unrecognized influence over the rest of the ecclesiastical world. Then, if Christianity be true, there may, so far as the outward arrangements of the world are concerned, once more arise a Christendom, stripped indeed of much that is essential to religion in the eyes of polemical theologians, but as united, grand, and powerful, as capable of pervading with its spirit the whole frame of society, as fruitful of religious art and all other manifestations of religious life, as Christendom was before the great schism, but resting on the adamantine basis of free conviction, instead of the sandy foundation of human authority and tradition supported by political power. Those who imagine that such a consummation, if it come, must come with terrible convulsions and distress, do not consider that a great part of educated Europe has, in fact, for some time been united, and guided in the conduct of life, and in all international and general relations, by a common Christianity. The world, as usual, has anticipated the results of speculation by tacitly solving a great practical problem for itself; and it has found that the brightness of the sunbeam resides in the sunbeam, not in the motes, and that the crystal floor of heaven is not unstable as water because it is as clear.

In Goldwin Smith's style of mind and language there is something reminding us of Sir James Mackintosh. The same spirit of expansive benevolent liberality, the same aspirations for human

good, the same firm grasp upon the essential truth of Christianity, the same cheerful philosophy expressed in a transparent elevated style, often of senatorial-like eloquence. After dwelling for a while in the earthly murky atmosphere of Mill, Comte, and Spencer, we are translated in his pages to a region of purer ether and serener sunlight.

---

*The Glory and Shame of England.* By C. Edwards Lester. Two vols. 12mo., pp. 601. New York: Bartram & Lester. 1866.

Some twenty-five years since Mr. Lester's first volumes with the same title were published, when they attained considerable popularity. In the severe criticisms to which they were subjected on both sides of the Atlantic, many important statements made by him were disputed; but repeated visits to that country, together with parliamentary reports, and the course of legislation, have only justified his humiliating conclusions. That work, rewritten, enlarged, and brought down to the present time, is now sent forth, exhibiting England to herself and the world.

A true American will exult in England's glory rather than in her shame. Until within a brief space, her history is our own. Her long line of heroes, her poets and divines, her orators and statesmen, are ours as well as hers. The principles of law as expounded by her great judges are authorities in our courts. Her ancient struggles for liberty against divine right, for the people against the aristocracy, were for us. We are sprung from her loins. Goldwin Smith was right in saying that we were born not without a mother's pangs, and that the real hour of our birth was the English revolution of the seventeenth century. Pride of language, religion, race, and inheritance has thrown for us a charm around her history and name. We spontaneously glory in her greatness, and blush for her dishonor, as we do not and cannot for any other nation. We are therefore more quick to resent, though not to see, injustice from her than from any other.

England is glorious because of the great intellects that have gathered around her throne; her great thinkers and brilliant literature; her Protestantism and Christian missionaries; the solidity of her government; her extensive dominions, which in her threescore colonies place empires under her scepter; her commerce, extending to the remotest limits of the earth, and bringing the treasures of all nations to her feet; her machinery, by which she does the work of a thousand millions of men; her navy, which could stretch a line of ships, stationed at intervals of four miles,

from Liverpool to New York; and for the moral power which gives her influence among the nations of the earth.

But with all her magnificence and glory, she abounds in wretchedness and shame unequaled by any other civilized nation. Something must be fearfully wrong in the system of government that makes the rich richer and the poor poorer, and can then find no better mode of preventing revolution than the exportation of labor. The fault of England is not that she is a monarchy, but that she perpetuates the old struggle between feudalism and the people. She has never learned that man has rights as man, and that government is ordained for man, and not man for the government. She begins to reckon at the wrong end. All right, all power, center in the throne from which they emanate. Grants conferred rather than rights acknowledged, often at the expense of civil war, have made her brilliant aristocracy the real rulers of England. But they derived their power from the throne and not the people: they know nothing of the rights of the people except to obey. A reform bill is, therefore, in their view, not a demand for justice, but a usurpation to be resisted until surrender is the only protection against insurrection. The aristocracy constitute the government. The great middle class, beginning with the doctrine that manhood has rights, thus reckoning from the other end of the line, are clamorous for political rights; but beneath them is another class crushed to the earth in ignorance, wretchedness, and shame, between whom and their oppressors the deep gulf is daily widening.

The hardy yeomanry which was once the proud boast of the nation, has nearly disappeared. While the population has increased fivefold in the last one hundred and seventy years, the number of landholders has decreased from 170,000 to 30,766. This union of small farms, or their absorption by the wealthier of the middle class, while it may exalt the aristocracy, inevitably renders tenants and laborers more dependent on the will of the lord of the soil, and therefore reduces them to a lower and more hopeless state. As hope of rising diminishes, the peasantry is losing in social condition. Emigration, which poverty forbids, a little lower depth, and then the workhouse, are their only refuges. A large proportion of them are unable to read, and no effort is made to teach them. Crowded together in small cottages, with the sexes mingling in a disgusting familiarity never known even on a southern plantation, immorality and indecency are on a fearful increase. In the coal mines, where children are set at work at six

and even four years of age, men and women work together in nakedness, and girls and married women, who must go to the mines or starve, are compelled to draw loads on all fours like horses. Notwithstanding the tears of duchesses over the sorrows of the negro, no lasting reform has been effected. The work people, driven from the rural districts, have been crowded into the manufacturing towns by millions. They are mostly mere human machines, utterly useless out of their special groove. An operative's life is a struggle for bread. They are stupidly ignorant. During the late distress it was found that seventy per cent. could not read. Eighty per cent. of the women could not sew, and mothers of half a dozen children had never handled a needle. Such ignorance must suffer. The scenes of degradation in the large cities are simply horrible; and one half of the children are growing up uneducated, and untrained for a better style of life. The Established Church has its splendors, but it is a huge engine of oppression to the poor, from the mouths of whose starving children it takes bread. Its revenue of fifty millions of dollars is wrung from the masses, to three fourths of whom it is not a spiritual fold. Its bishops are peers of the realm, and its ministers are allies of the aristocracy, compelled from interest to side with the privileged class in any contest with the people.

And what of Ireland? English rule for the sake of English ascendency has cheated her, robbed her, persecuted her, betrayed her; saddled her with an alien Church, depopulated her, and ground her peasantry into the dust. Few pages of history are darker and more shameful than those which record the barbarism of England in Ireland and the East Indies.

Her aristocracy, upon which, rather than her *people*, the blame must rest, though shedding maudlin tears over oppression and wrong which they do not themselves inflict, are foes to all democracy, both at home and abroad. They could weep over African slavery until a rebellion by a slaveholding oligarchy threatened to destroy the greatest republic on earth, when their greater hatred of democracy with an indecent haste proclaimed to the rebels belligerent rights. England's chosen symbol aptly illustrates her spirit: the British lion loves to show his power where he dares. The blowing of Sepoys from the cannon's mouth, the massacre of negroes in Jamaica, and the menacing roar accompanying the demand for the surrender of Mason and Slidell, have the same character, and are akin to the cowardly desertion of Denmark in her hour of need. It was this England that, to help a

rebel aristocracy, to break down the Republic, to cripple our commerce, to gather into her own hands the carrying trade of the world, and to recover her lost supremacy on the sea, assumed to measure her international obligations by her own municipal laws, sent forth her ships, armed with British guns and manned by British sailors, to prey on our commerce, and make British ports throughout the world a safe refuge for a score of corsairs. Thank God! she failed, and no glory of success can overshadow her shame. The Republic lives, and England's proud navy is confounded at the presence of the little Miantonomah. W.

---

*The Elements of Moral Science.* By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D.D., LL.D. Revised and improved edition. 12mo., pp. 396. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

*Moral Philosophy, Including Theoretical and Practical Ethics.* By JOSEPH HAVEN, D.D. 12mo., pp. 306. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

We notice these works not to review them, but to illustrate some reflections on the necessity of a *reconstruction of moral science.* The popular and excellent work of Dr. Wayland has two grave defects:

1. It makes the idea of right or wrong to arise in the mind solely in view of our relations to God and to other intelligent and sentient beings. But is it not clear to every one's consciousness that we have also the idea of right and wrong in reference to ourselves alone. Were we destitute of the knowledge of God and of other intelligent and sentient creatures, should we not feel it wrong to abuse our own persons or to violate the laws of life and health? If this be so, then Dr. Wayland has ignored a third part of theoretical and practical ethics. Dr. Haven has not fallen into this error, and accordingly we find a chapter on the duties we owe ourselves, namely, self-support, self-defense, self-control, and self-culture.

2. But both Dr. Haven and Dr. Wayland, following most writers on moral science, have confined the action of conscience to voluntary conduct, and have made right and wrong to reside wholly in the intentions. Theologians, on the other hand, have found a moral character in our impulses and states of mind; but many have erred, it seems to us, in the *kind of moral character* to be attributed to them. Here is a discrepancy between theology and philosophy, which might be avoided by a more exact analysis of the operations of conscience. Conscience does characterize our tempers and states of mind as right or wrong in themselves, distinctively from the choices and overt acts which follow

from them. But how? If those tempers are not yielded to, it does not indeed charge us with guilt and desert of punishment as in the case of wrong actions, but it awakens a painful sense of degradation and vileness. A feeling of chagrin and shame, but not of remorse, is what we experience on such an occasion. A child of an irascible temper may restrain himself when moved to strike his playmate, and he may restrain himself, and even gain merit, by using a kind word instead of a rough blow; but he will reflect upon himself for his bad temper, and in his prayer at night he will confess that he has a wicked heart. Now philosophy should recognize this twofold operation of conscience, and theology ought not to commit the absurdity of pronouncing the soul guilty and deserving of punishment for inborn tempers, and especially when they are bravely resisted. When the Bible speaks of these tendencies as *sins*, it is in view of their being contrary to perfect love and to an enlightened conscience, for sin, according to the Scriptures, is any "transgression of the law," whether designed or not, whether in thought, or feeling, or deed; but not as involving guilt and desert of punishment. Hence believers are justified by grace, while yet they have occasion to grieve over their evil tempers, and are affectingly taught to seek for further inspiration of grace for the regulation of their passions and entire sanctification.

3. There is another attribute of conscience which is overlooked in philosophy, but which is familiar to theology, namely, desire. This attribute is ascribed to all natural sensibilities—but why not to the moral sensibilities? Whence is that longing for goodness, of which every one is conscious at times, if not from the moral sensibilities. It is something distinct from the emotions of approval or disapproval and from the feelings of obligation; it is a yearning for virtue. "Why are you crying, my child?" said a mother to her little boy, as she heard him sobbing, when she was about leaving him at night. "Mother," said the child, "I want to be good." It was this Jesus referred to when he said, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." The Gospel of Christ shows itself based on the truest science of the human mind. Whatever it implies of mental traits will be found in the consciousness when properly analyzed. Dr. Haven would say that this analysis belongs to psychology rather than to moral philosophy; but we think that part of psychology which elucidates our moral faculties ought to be the basis of moral science. Indeed moral science is chiefly the analysis of the

conscience, and its relations to the other attributes and operations of the mind.

Dr. Haven discusses the old question of the ground of obligation, or "what constitutes right." He does not find it in utility, or law, divine or human, or in the nature and character of God, but in "the eternal nature of things." Right is eternal, but what were "things" before the creation? Nothing then existed but the Divine Mind. Can we do better than to conclude that the ideas of right and wrong were necessary ideas of the Divine Intelligence, and that God made man capable of having the same ideas? Why God had these ideas is no more of a question than why he existed. He framed the moral world under the light of these ideas, and his law is but a declaration of them in their relation to the conduct and character of his creatures: in other words, his will is in accordance with his ideas of right; not the source of right, but the declaration of it. We have the ideas of right and wrong because we were made to have them on certain occasions. In the same way we have the ideas of the beautiful on certain occasions. Why they arise rather than other ideas, we cannot say. These are the bounds of knowledge. There is no more propriety in asking what constitutes the right, than in asking what constitutes the beautiful. This brings us again to the conclusion that a perfect moral philosophy must be based upon a perfect psychology. C. K. T.

## *Belle-Lettres, Classical, and Philological.*

*Clever Stories of Many Nations.* Rendered in Rhyme by JOHN G. SAXE. Illustrated by W. L. CHAMPNEY. 12mo., pp. 192. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1865.

*The Masquerade and Other Poems.* By JOHN GODFREY SAXE. 12mo., pp. 237. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866.

WITH no low appeals to our baser nature, and no stirring of our highest feelings, Mr. Saxe, in his airy mid-flight, has attained an enviable personal and poetical popularity with all classes, but especially with those who love a cheerful muse. The present two volumes will keep his popularity fresh and living, without elevating it to a higher mark, or giving the public any impression of nobler or broader capabilities than heretofore evinced. His productions are all of one class; giving us the impression of powers for higher performances than he ever attempts. He is content to enshrine in facile, and often brilliant versification, the light anecdote, the witty point, the

oriental apologue, the fashionable folly, the comic courtship, the conjugal bicker, the classic travesty; some with a true moral, some with the mock moral as part of the witticism; some with no moral; but perhaps none with a very positive *immoral*. His genius has succeeded, within its own chosen department, in spreading its productions broadcast over the land. And if we understand rightly he has reaped a goodly harvest pecuniary as well as poetical. He could gayly boast that his "Pegasus" has been a *paying* animal, and his poetical flowers have proved a profitable vegetable; so that his horticulture (as well as his horsiculture) has been a good investment. And that is all right. There is no reason in these days why a poet should be paid with merely a draught of immortality an eternity after date, rather than a good bank check payable at sight.

The first of the gay volumes on our table ranges for its topics mainly through the Orient, and through the European middle ages, with a slight call or so in the region of classical mythology. The poet concludes, however, like a good patriot, at home; and, like a good moralist, with a temperance poem quite worthy to be committed to memory and to heart by our Young America. It is entitled "The Snake in the Glass," and is a rapid narrative of a youth who imbibed the delirium tremens.

The fellow fell into a snooze, my lad,
'Tis *a horrible slumber he takes;*
He trembles with fear,
And acts very queer;
My eyes! how he shivers and shakes
When he wakes,
And raves about horrid great snakes.

'T is a warning to you and to me, my lad,
A particular caution to all,—
Though no one can see
The vipers but he,
To hear the poor lunatic bawl:
"How they crawl!
All over the floor and the wall."

And then comes the very serious moral:

You've heard of the snake in the grass, my lad,
Of the viper concealed in the grass,
But now you must know,
Man's deadliest foe
Is a snake of a different class;
Alas!
'T is the viper that lurks in the glass.

The second volume is more occidental and American. The first and longest poem is by no means the best. Miscellaneous pieces

form the main share of the book, followed by *sonnets*, all in the humorous strain; and lastly come epigrams, which are all of course *meant* to be humorous. We give our readers an apropos specimen:

THE GRATEFUL PREACHER.

A strolling preacher, "once upon a time,"
Addressed a congregation rather slim
In numbers; yet his subject was sublime,
('T was "Charity;") sonorous was the hymn,
Fervent the prayer; and though the house was small,
He pounded lustily the sacred word,
And preached an hour as loud as he could bawl,
As one who meant the gospel should be heard.
And now, behold, the preacher's hat is sent
Among the pews for customary pence,
But soon returns as empty as it went!
Whereat—low bowing to the audience—
He said, "My preaching is not all in vain;
Thank God! I've got my beaver back again!"

## *Miscellaneous.*

*The Centenary Pictorial.*

Mr. Tibbals is entitled to credit for the *idea* of a Centenary Pictorial, and to no special discredit for the style of the execution. Pictorials are the mania of the day, and public taste is not exacting of likeness where there is the merit of cheapness. The engravings of this work are as good as the method allows; the reading matter is valuable; and we are not surprised that its editions sell rapidly.

*History of Julius Cæsar.* Vol. II. The Wars in Gaul. 8vo., pp. 659. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*Appleton's Hand-Book of American Travel.* The Southern Tour. Being a Guide through Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Kentucky. With Descriptive Sketches of the Cities, Towns, Waterfalls, Battlefields, Mountains, Rivers, Lakes, Hunting and Fishing-Grounds, Watering-Places, Summer Resorts, and all Scenes and Objects of Importance and Interest. With Maps of the Leading Routes of Travel and of the Principal Cities. By EDWARD H. HALL. Pp. 142. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

An invaluable guide-book for the traveler through the "Sunny South."

*English Travelers and Italian Brigands.* A Narrative of Capture and Captivity. By W. J. C. MOENS. With a Map and several Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 355. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*Sherbrooke.* By the Author of "Madge." 12mo., pp. 463. Appleton & Co. 1866.

*Land at Last.* A Novel in three books. By EDMUND YATES. 12mo., pp. 150. Harper & Brothers.

*The Hidden Sin.* A Novel. With numerous illustrations. 8vo., pp. 189. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*Battle Pieces and Aspects of the War.* By HERMAN MELVILLE. 12mo., pp. 272. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

*Frederick the Great and his Court.* An Historical Romance. By L. MÜLBACH, author of "Joseph II. and his Court." Translated from the German by Mrs. CHAPMAN COLEMAN and her daughters. 12mo., pp. 434. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

---

OUR Index in the present number obliges us to defer notices of the following books to the next Quarterly:

*James Freeman Clarke on Orthodoxy.* Walker, Fuller, & Co.
*Masson's Recent British Philosophy.* Appleton & Co.
*Ecce Homo.* Roberts Brothers.
*Robert Buchanan's Poems.* Roberts Brothers.
*New Physiognomy; or, Signs of Character.* Fowler & Wells.

---

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.—Our editorial brother of the "Christian Advocate" informs his readers that at a certain dinner the Methodist editors, "with only one exception," agreed to print certain slips, to be sent out by an executive committee, on Lay Representation. Now as the editor of the Quarterly Review was present at the said dinner, but made no such agreement, nor any agreement whatever, upon that occasion, we assume that he is the "exception," and return our thanks to our editorial brother for his care and candor in acknowledging it. We were unaware of such agreement by an editor.

# INDEX.


Abbey: Church and Ministry.....Page 475
Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Church of Christ and the Gospel Ministry.... 475
End of the Apostolic Succession..... 475
Agassiz: Structure of Animal Life..... 480
Almanac. Centenary..... 163
—— Methodist ..... 163
American Cyclopedia. Annual..... 601
American Presbyterian and Theological Review..... 137, 469, 601
Antichrist, the 1260 years of..... 235
Scripture notation of prophetic time.... 236
Description of Antichrist ..... 239
Period of the Church's Apostacy ..... 240
To be a Roman power..... 244
And its last development ..... 248
The ten horns and the little horn ..... 250
A political sovereignty..... 252
The time of its attainment ..... 254
Apology of Faith..... 135
Appleton's Handbook of American Travel.. 635
Astie: History of the United States..... 136

Barnabas, Treatises on the Epistle of..... 584
Barnes: The Body Politic..... 483
Baur: Lectures on the history of Church Doctrines..... 136
Beyschlag: Christology of the New Testament .....288, 467, 612
Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review 289, 469, 601
Bibliotheca Sacra..... 137, 289, 469
Boehm, Rev. Henry, Reminiscences of .... 386
Early life and experience..... 387
Advantages of Methodist itineracy..... 390
Methodist singing..... 393
Methodist revivals..... 394
Growth of episcopal power ..... 397
Church organization..... 399
The General Conference ..... 400
Incidents ..... 402
Our Centenary..... 406
Bossuet as a Persecutor..... 22
His sophistries..... 23
The Edict of Nantes..... 24
Tampering with the records ..... 26
Preventing Protestants from leaving the kingdom ..... 28
Persecution of the Miral children..... 30
Testimony of the Abbe Frotte..... 35
Results of the persecution..... 36
Boston Review..... 601
Bowes: Illustrative Gatherings for Preachers and Teachers..... 143
Bright, John..... 407
Early life ..... 408
Entrance into Parliament ..... 409
Sentiments toward the United States ..... 410
As an orator ..... 412
As a politician..... 413
As a reformer ..... 414
Brainard, John, Life of..... 307
British and Foreign Evangelical Review 138, 290, 470, 602
British Quarterly Review....138, 290, 470, 602
Broglio: The Church and the empire of the fourth century ..... 288
Brown: The Home Life ..... 608
Brown, Thomas, Philosophy of.....Page 283
Buchanan, Robert: Poems..... 636
Buck: Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law, 324, 473
Bulwer: The Lost Tales of Miletus..... 484
Bushnell's Vicarious Sacrifice..... 350
Definition and use of the term Vicarious.. 353
God and man as fellow natures..... 354
Christ's meeting standard obligations.... 355
Distinction between "Law before government" and law in "instituted government"..... 357
The doctrine of justice..... 360
Reconciliation..... 363
Interpretation ..... 365
Sacrifice ..... 368
Other statements ..... 369

Carlyle: History of Frederick the Great ..... 164, 484
Centenary Association, American Methodist Ladies'..... 318
Its origin..... 318
Dr. Lore's proposition ..... 319
Why a great Centenary building should be located in New York..... 321
Centenary of American Methodism..... 165
General History of the Century..... 166
General Conference action on the celebration ..... 168
Committees and their doings..... 169
Dr. Stevens's Centenary Volume..... 170
What is Methodism?..... 171
Its origin and growth..... 172
Its practical system..... 173
Its achievements..... 175
Its capabilities and responsibilities..... 177
Arrangements for the Centenary celebration ..... 179
Centenary Educational Fund..... 181
Exhortation to action ..... 184
Amount to be raised ..... 185
Centenary Pamphlets..... 318
Centenary Pictorial..... 635
Charpentier: Comparative Legislation..... 283
Cherry and Violet..... 484
Christian Advocate, The..... 309
Christian Commission, Memorial Record of New York Branch of..... 484
Christianity, The Shadow of..... 324
Christian Remembrancer.....138, 290, 470, 602
Childhood Conversion..... 531
Children are in danger of perishing..... 532
They may and ought to be saved..... 535
Means of instruction..... 537
Parental Instruction ..... 538
Sunday-school instruction..... 540
Baptized children ..... 541
Instruction specially adapted to children. 542
Means adapted to the salvation of children ..... 544
Clarke, J. F., on Orthodoxy..... 636
Cobden, Richard ..... 164
Colenso: A new aspect of the Controversy ..... 280
Chemnitz, Martin..... 600
Colored People, Relations of to the M. E. Church, South ..... 418
Labors of the early Methodists .... . .. 419

Colored People:
Religious fervor of the blacks.....Page 421
Scientific theories concerning them..... 422
"Black Harry" and "Punch"..... 423
The founding of colored missions..... 425
Mode of missionary labor..... 427
Perils of the missionary..... 430
The mission work under the Church South..... 431
Negro missions vs. the abolition controversy..... 432
Inability of the Church South to sustain her negro missions..... 433
Supplement by the editor..... 435
Report of the Southern Missionary Society..... 435
Churchly position of the colored race..... 436
Negro education..... 436
African M. E. Church to the Southern General Conference..... 437
—— History of the..... 438
—— Their opinion of the northern Church 441
Social separateness of the races..... 442
Coquerel: Persecution of French Protestants..... 467

Dantier: Benedictine Monasteries of Italy.. 467
Dieckhoff: Luther on the power of the Church..... 136
Dissaudier: Spiritualism..... 288
Divine Passion..... 64
Infinite happiness of God..... 65
—— Affected by human conduct..... 68
Nature of Divine sympathy..... 70
Inferences from nature..... 71
Doolittle: Social life among the Chinese... 809
Draper, H., A Text-book of Chemistry .... 484
— J. C., A Text-book on Anatomy, Physiology and Hygiene..... 481
— J. W., M. D., History of the Intellectual Development of Europe..... 485
— J. W., A Text-book of Physiology.... 484

Ecce Homo..... 636
Edinburgh Review..... 138, 290, 470, 602
Edward, The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost..... 324
Evangelical Quarterly Review.... 137, 470, 601
Ewald on Hebrew Poetry..... 287

Fallonx: Letters of Mme. Swetchine..... 467
Feurbach: God, Freedom, and Immortality 467
Foote: War of the Revolution..... 306
Foreign Religious Intelligence, 130, 280, 463, 595
Foxton: Herman, or Young Knighthood... 324
Frank: Mystical Philosophy in France .... 467
Freppel: Clement d'Alexandria..... 289
—— St. Cyprian..... 289
Freewill Baptist Quarterly....137, 290, 470, 601

Gasparin: The Family, its duties, joys, and sorrows..... 136
General Conference, The Second..... 325
Inaccuracies in early Methodist history .. 326
Omissions in General Conference Journals 327
Call for the Conference of 1787..... 328
Its character..... 329
Character of the Session in 1792..... 332
Asbury's Council..... 333
O'Kelly's resolution on the episcopate, 334, 338
Modifications in the office of Presiding Elder..... 335
Various amendments..... 336
Asbury's position and feelings..... 338
Withdrawal of O'Kelly..... 341
His schism..... 344
Character of the primitive itinerants..... 348
Gilchrist; Richard Cobden..... 164
Gioualliac: History of Catholic Doctrine.. 289
Gobinean: Religions and Philosophies of Central Asia.....Page 466
Goulburn: Introduction to the Devotional Study of the Holy Scriptures....324, 484
—— The Idle Word..... 484
Greek Church, The, Considered particularly in its relation to the Protestant..... 496
Cyril Lucar..... 497
Ecclesiastical position of Russia..... 500
Peter the Great and the English divines. 501
Recent courtesies..... 502
Possibility of fraternization..... 504
The rule of Greek faith and practice..... 506
The faith of the Greek Church..... 508
Its views of Predestination..... 511
Greek, how can we teach?..... 90
Lack of general interest in..... 90
Modern, objections to, met..... 92
—— pronunciation and accounts of..... 97
—— advantages of teaching..... 98
Guizot: Meditations upon the Present State of the Christian Religion..... 463

Hacket: Christian Memorials of the War.. 140
Hague: Christianity and Statesmanship... 160
Hamline, L.L., Life and Letters of..... 618
Hann: Idea of Absolute Personality..... 146
Hansrath: The Apostle Paul..... 289
Haupt: Episcopacy of the German Reformation..... 600
Harper's History of the Great Rebellion.. 623
Hatch: The Constitution of Man..... 300
Haven, G: The Pilgrim's Wallet..... 302
Haven, Jos., Moral Philosophy..... 631
Hawthorne, Nathaniel..... 51
Birthplace and early life..... 52
Twice-Told Tales and other early writings..... 54
Blithedale Romance and Moses from an Old Manse..... 56
The Salem Custom-House..... 57
The Scarlet Letter, and House of the Seven Gables..... 59
Consul to Liverpool..... 61
The Marble Faun..... 61
Rank as a writer..... 63
Heart and Voice, the..... 164
Held: Jesus the Christ..... 467
Hermeneutics and Homiletics..... 37
Knowledge and eloquence..... 38
The Apostles' power..... 40
Intellectual advantages of scriptural study..... 41
Moral advantages of..... 43
Hints on..... 44
Further on study of sacred language.... 49
Objections: the time required..... 371
Popular prejudices against use of in pulpit..... 374
Methodist Preaching, Biblical..... 376
Biblical Learning for Missionary Work 377
Practical remarks..... 379
Hidden Sin, the..... 636
Hilgenfeld: New Testament Apocrypha.. 287
Hinsdale: Coming to the King..... 471
Historical Position, Our, as Indicated by Nature and Philosophy..... 5
Westward Course of History and Nature, 6
History of the individual and of the race compared..... 7
Three great original innate ideas..... 7
Three great corresponding epochs in history—the Asiatic..... 9
The European or second epoch..... 10
The American or third epoch..... 13
Its physical characteristics..... 13
Its political organization..... 15
Its Christianity..... 18
The responsibility of our destiny..... 19

Holland: Plain Talks on Familiar Subjects..... Page 324
Hosse: Prolegomena of an Exegetical Handbook to Isaiah..... 149
House of Refuge, Hymns for the..... 324
Hovey: Scriptural Law of Divorce..... 484
Hurst: History of Rationalism..... 142, 287

Ide: Battle Echoes..... 484
Ingelow: Stories Told to a Child..... 324
Itinerancy, Our..... 73
Theological commission..... 73
Features disadvantageous to congregation 75
—Restricted in choice..... 75
—Strange pastors..... 76
—Reduction of cohesive force..... 77
—Inopportune changes ..... 79
—Conducive to love of novelty..... 80
—Lack of feeling of responsibility..... 81
Features disadvantageous to the ministry 83
—Restriction in choice..... 83
—Living among strangers..... 84
—Homelessness..... 85
—Lack of accumulated influence..... 86
—Support and popularity..... 87
Features advantageous to the people.... 206
—Constant supply of pastors..... 206
—Pastoral independence of speech..... 207
—Change of pastors made easy..... 208
—Variety of talent secured..... 211
—Incentives to vigorous action..... 212
Features advantageous to pastors..... 213
—Pastoral work secured..... 213
—Opportunity for preparation of sermons 215
—Conducive to health and long life..... 218
Lack of stability and its remedy..... 220

Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie.... 139, 471
John, St., Commentary on the Gospel of... 295
Johnson, Andrew, Life and Times of..... 615
Journal of Sacred Literature ..... 470

Kelm: The Christ of History..... 467

Lacordaire: His Inner Religious life..... 368
Laurent: The Christ of History..... 467
Lange: A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures..... 479
Historical development of Materialism... 600
Lebland: Christian Inscriptions in Gaul... 289
Lester: Glory and Shame of England..... 628
Lee, Jesse: Short History of the Methodists..... 325
Lee, Luther: Natural Theology..... 608
Lewis: Biographical History of Philosophy 485
Liberalism in Europe..... 256
Difficulties in writing contemporaneous history ..... 256
Progress of thought in Turkey..... 258
Wallachia, Russia..... 259
Spain, Greece..... 260
Switzerland, Holland..... 261
Belgium, Scandinavia, Italy..... 262
France..... 263
Germany..... 264
Classes of Liberals, their principles and prospects ..... 266
Their opposition to Christianity..... 270
Conservative Christians..... 272
England falling behind..... 274
Literary Intelligence, Foreign 135, 287, 466, 599
France..... 136, 288, 467
Germany..... 135, 287, 466, 599
Livingstone, Expedition to the Zambezi... 484
London Quarterly Review..... 138, 290, 471
Luthardt: Fundamental Truths of Christianity ..... 144

Mangold: Epistle to the Romans..... 600
Mann, Horace, Life of..... 152
Manning: Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost..... Page 476
Margerie: Essays on God, Creation, and Providence..... 288
Martin: History of France..... 324
Mary Powell, Maiden and Married Life of 484
Masson: Recent British Philosophy..... 636
M'Cosh: Intuitions of the Mind, Inductively Investigated ..... 449
M'Donald: Spiritualism, Ancient Sorcery, etc..... 296
Melville's Battle Pieces and Aspects of the War..... 636
Methodisms, The Two, North and South.. 271
Changes proposed by Southern General Conference ..... 276
Their bearing toward the North..... 277
Steps toward concillation..... 278
Merivale: Conversion of the Roman empire ..... 155
Michael Servetus..... 609
Milton's Early Life..... 580
Birthplace ..... 580
Fitting for college..... 583
His Cambridge life..... 586
Retires to the country..... 591
Moens: English Travelers and Italian Brigands ..... 635
Mohammed ..... 602
Moore, A.: Notes from the Plymouth Pulpit..... 224, 484
Moore, F.: Speeches of John Bright..... 407
Mosaic History of Creation and Geology—Latest Attempts to Harmonize the.. 187
Four theories of harmony..... 188
Literal agreement, its supporters and its difficulties ..... 188
The diluvian hypothesis..... 193
The restitutionary hypothesis..... 198
The theory of ideal agreement..... 201
Muenscher: Manual of Biblical Interpretation ..... 224
Mulbach's Frederick the Great and his Court 636
Myers, Southern Christian Advocate..... 160

Napoleon: History of Julius Cæsar..... 635
New Englander, The..... 137, 290, 470, 601
New Orleans Advocate, The..... 311
North British Review..... 138, 471

Palmer: Four Years in the Old World.... 481
Life and Writings of L. L. Hamline.... 618
Perrard: History of Oratory..... 289
Petavel's Society for the Translation of the Bible..... 463
Plain Talks on Familiar Subjects..... 164
Pressense: Jesus Christ ..... 289, 467
Public Opinion, Origin of Revolutions in.. 485
Theory of individual development as applied to the race..... 486
Influence of the material element..... 488
The creative element of mind..... 490
Mechanical causes..... 491
Superiority of mind to matter..... 494

Quarterly Book-Table..... 140, 293, 473, 608

Reid: Voices of the Soul Answered in God. 151
Religious Intelligence, Foreign, 130, 280, 463, 595
Russia ..... 598
Scandinavia..... 597
Catholic Congress..... 134
France ..... 465
Germany..... 131
Great Britain..... 130, 280, 463, 595
Greek Church..... 284
Italy ..... 133
Madagascar..... 133
Mexico..... 132
Renan: History of the Origin of Christianity 469

Revue Chrétienne.....Page 140, 472
Revue des deux Mondes..... 140, 292, 473
Rinck: The Resurrection..... 293
Ritchie: Scripture Testimony against Intoxicating Wine..... 158
Ritbore: Philosophy of Thomas Brown... 288
Robertson, Frederick W ..... 560
Extraordinary mental gifts..... 561
Sketch of life..... 562
Theological views and changes..... 564
Hostility to evangelicalism ..... 566
Feeling of isolation..... 567
Secret of his influence..... 570
Seeking for truth in error,..... 572
Various erroneous views..... 573
Modifying considerations..... 577
Böttscher: Dogmatic System of Luther... 467

Saxe: Stories of Many Nations..... 633
Masquerade, the, and other poems..... 633
Shadow of Christianity, the..... 484
Sherbrooke..... 635
Smith, Goldwin: Lectures on History..... 624
Southern Christian Advocate ..... 160
Southern General Conference, The N. Y. East Conference and the..... 443
Origin of the resolutions sent..... 443
The concert of prayer..... 446
Second set of resolutions..... 447
Ambiguity of southern telegram..... 448
Report of Conference committee..... 451
Dr. Wightman's mistake..... 455
Southern reception of the telegram..... 456
Proper principles of intercommunion.... 459
Southern General Conference action.... 461
Southern Methodist Press, Spirit of..... 124
Loyalty and peace..... 125
Negro treatment..... 127
Church conciliation..... 128
South, North and, The Two Methodisms, (See Methodisms)..... .....
Spencer: Principles of Biology..... 479
Social Statics..... 485
Stephen, Life and Martyrdom of..... 222
Appointment of, as Archdeacon..... 222
Before the Helenistic Synagogue..... 224
Before the Jewish Sanhedrim..... 226
His death..... 231
Results of his martyrdom and its lesson.. 233
Stevens: Centenary of American Methodism..... 141, 165
Women of Methodism..... 303
Stelr, Rudolf: Theological Remains of..... 147
Stone: Living Temple, the..... 477
Studien und Kritiken..... 291, 471
Swetchine, Mme, Letters of..... 467
Synopsis of the Quarterlies... 137, 289, 469, 601

Thompson: Living Forces, etc.....Page 324
Tilton: Fly, The..... 163
——Golden-haired Gertrude..... 163
Tischendorf: Monumenta Sacra Inedita.... 287
Apocalypses. Apocryphal..... 284
Towle: History of Henry V..... 483
Tulloch: Beginning Life..... 324
Tweedie: The Early Choice..... 479
Tyerman: Life and Times of Samuel Wesley 630

Universalist Quarterly, The..... 631

Vander Palm, Life and Character of..... 157
Voltaire..... 346
Early fame as a poet..... 346
Dramatic writings..... 348
Residence at the Prussian Court..... 350
Historical writings..... 353
His retreat at Ferney..... 354
Atheism and impiety..... 356
Last public triumph and death..... 359
Vosen on Galileo..... 466

Wayland: Elements of Moral Science, 164, 324, 631
Warren's Introduction to Systematic Theology ..... 109
Faith, action, and theology..... 109
Wesley as a theologian..... 101
Watson's Institutes..... 103
American Methodist theology ..... 104
Division of the subject..... 106
Four thorough systems..... 111
Romanism and Calvinism..... 112
Lutheranism ..... 113
Methodism ..... 116
—Its formal principle..... 120
—Its theological merits..... 122
Wesley, Rev. Samuel, Life and Times of.. 630
Westminster Review..... 134, 290, 471
Whedon: Commentary on Luke and John. 474
Willett: Herod Antipas..... 479
Wood: Homes without Hands..... 614
Worship of Relics, and Miracles of the Ancient Church..... 514
Worship of saints..... 515
Worship of relics..... 516
Superstitions and Idolatrous..... 520
Teachings of the Church..... 522
Considerations against them..... 524

Yates: Land at Last..... 636

Zeitschrift fur Historische Theologie.. 133, 292, 471, 644
Zeitschrift Fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie 474
Zemple: Essays and Reviews..... 455

1 4581